

A DEFENCE
OF A TREATISE TOV-
CHING THE SVFFERINGS
AND VICTORIE OF CHRIST IN
THE WORKE OF OVR

Redemption
wherein is confirmed,

- 1 That Christ suffered for vs, not only Bodily griefe, but also
in his Soule an impression of the proper wrath of God,
which may be called the paines of Hell.
- 2 That after his death on the Crosse he went not downe into
Hell.

For man of flesh that hath a heart and a power of reason...
For Answer to the late writings of M^r Bilson, L. Bi-
shop of Winchester, which he intitlith, *The effect of*
certaine sermons, &c. Wherein he strueth
mightily against the doctrine
aforesaid.

By HENRY IACOB Minister of the worde
of God.

John 7. ver. 24.
Iudge not according to the appearance, but iudge righteous
iudgement,



1600.

STC 14333

OK A TRUST

THE TRUST OF

AND

in the year of our Lord 1800, the first day of January, the said Trust was made between the said parties, and the said parties have since that time been acting in accordance with the provisions of the said Trust.

For a further to the late will of Mr. William J. B. of the County of ... State of ... which is in the ... of the said ... in the ... of the said ...

BY ... of the words

Teste ...



1800

To all the godly and religious Magi-
strates, faithfull Pastors, and other Christian
brethren in England, Grace and peace be multi-
plied in the true sufferings and victorie of
IESVS CHRIST, our onely and
most glorious Redeemer.



I VE me leaue I beseech you (Fathers
and Brethren right honorable & beloved
in Christ) in so great and necessary a case
to reply and Defend my selfe in such wise
as becommeth me against the vnseeme-
ly writings of a mā, who indeed, I know-
ledg, in the world is far greater then I am. Yet forasmuch
as the Cause which heere I maintaine is right and iust, as
to any man I hope it shall soone appeare that will simply
and soberly trie it by the Scriptures: Again in regard of
mine owne person and poore credit, although meane in
the world, yet by Gods mercie such as in conscience I am
bound by all honest and Christian meanes to preserue, see-
ing he so strangely traducerh & accuseth me in his booke
as is almost incredible, I am therfore of necessity (as I take
it) to open my mouth at this time, and specially in the be-
halfe of that doctrine, which I am vndoubtedly perswaded,
for the substance of it, that hitherto I with infinite in
England haue truly & faithfully taught. And albeit I finde
my selfe very vnequall to try any question with him, who
is so high in authoritie, so prompt of wit, so exquisite in
learning, my selfe in all things so despised and rejected as I
am by him and some others: inasmuch that I might well
be altogether terrified and wholly turned away (were
my cause neuer so good) fro maintaining the same against
him: yet surely, God is my witnes, it seemeth to mee so
easy

easy and so plaine to defend, together with the necessarie
of duetie binding me (as likewise indeed all mē els I think)
to stande therevnto, that I could not choose but speake a-
gain in this matter, and cleere it againe so well as I can
from his further weake exceptions, and vnsufficient obie-
ctions against it. Neyther let any man thinke that in thus
doing I greatly please my selfe, or seeme vnwilling to let
others to vtter their iudgments heerevpon. Nay surely it
is the thing that heerein chiefly I desire, even that others,
yea many others (if so it may seeme good vnto thē) would
declare their mindes touching this new doctrine sprung
vp from Winchester, and likely to bring a common cala-
mitie with other errors mo vpon our Churches in Eng-
land, because I feare that not a few among vs, are, & wilbe
troubled therewith. And so I doubt not but it will most
amply appeare how Holy & true a doctrine this is, which
he so disdainfully skoffeth at and reprocheth, beeing well
assured that even the most learned and godly Teachers in
this land, Defendours of the trueth against Poperie, as wel
before time as now at this day vnder our gracious Queene,
doe concurre & agree with my opinion herein. This if it
shall please God that I may see, it wil far more exceedingly
please me to beholde, then whatsoever myne owne vn-
skilfulnes hath or can vtter. In the meane while, I beseech
thee, Christian Reader, consider duly with thy selfe, not
who speaketh, but what is spoken by eyther of vs. As for
me, I am not ashamed to testifie with all duetie, though
after my simplicitie, in the behalfe of the Gospell of Christ
against mens improbable conjectures; which my trust is
that the godly and sober minded will take in good worth
vprightly, even as my heart meaneth it (the Lord know-
eth) sincerely. The grace of our Lord Iesus Christ bee
with you all. Amen.

A Preface to the Christian Readers touching our 2. Questions and their Defense following.



IT is a iust thing with God (deare brethren) to punish
in his dissolute people sinne with sinne: and where
one iniquitie is not repented, to binde others there-
unto. Which thing surely we may to well see is com-
to passe and befallen vs in England desernedly at
this day. Who after so long, plentifull, and comfortable enioying of
the Gospell (the most precious blessing of God in this life) are now all-
most generally com to this, that we haue lost the loue thereof. What
remayneth then for vs, when we set so light by this Heauenly grace
forgetting our first loue which once wee seemed to beare towards it,
and wherein now wee ought to haue abounded, but that God should
punish this our hainous and generall sinne with others, and among o-
thers send vs delusions euen strong delusions to brooch & beleene lyes,
seeing we shew so small affection and so little pleasure in his truth.
The Lord in iustice then (no doubt) doth punish vs with such delusi-
ons of error as are now so rise in our land at this time, more then in
times past when as the Gospell hath ben soundlye preached and bet-
ter beloued among vs, then now it seemeth to bee. Now so much the
more dangerous this mischief is, as also it must needes prone yet still,
because it is offered vnto vs forsooth by the frendes of the Gospell,
and fathers of the Church as they desire to be called, yet being indeed
sole Commanders in Religion, very Lords ouer mens consciences, com-
pulsively ouerruling their brethren and Gods deare flocke; contrary
to the expresse Scripture, and all well ordered both Ancient and
present tymes. How needfull then is it that the Lords faithfull Re-
membrancers forget not themselves in these deceitfull dayes, nor that
great charge which the great Pastor of the Flock hath layd upon
them, but to bee watchfull and diligent and for no respect of persons
to suffer any part of the gracious truth of God to bee disgraced by
men: chiefly that part and point (if we can discern what it is) which
by the corruption thereof raiseth and maintaineth most of our other
vaine corrupt and contentious questions which now swarme among

11 Ma
and 2
1 Cor.
1. Cor.
1. Pet.

us, yet which easily would bee cut cleane downe if the word of God alone might beare sway, as we see it to be brought to passe this day by the blessing of God in other Reformed Churches of forraine Countries. For my part, being occasioned at this time more specially to speak of 2. of these foresaid corrupt doctrines, I am not unwilling (though unequally yoked) to defend the truth in them. It hath pleased Mr. Bilson the now L. Bishop of Winchester to begin among us a new matter of faith neuer heard of before in England (but only in the dayes of Popery) touching the Allsufficiency of the meere Bodily Sufferings of Christ, and to maintaine an other which was neere worne out, of his going downe to Hell in Soule. In both which because my conscience assured mee that hee was much mistaken, and laboured that others should mistake also, I thought it not besides my duty (the Lord offering me opportunity) to maintaine the truth, and that in all plainenes and evidence of the Scripture as God enabled me with. This now a while since being published (wherein my trust is I caryed my selfe no otherwise then I ought) the Author and maintayner of the contrary hath so of late intertayned it, as seemeth to mee and to many others wonderfull. Wonderfull, not for strength of reasons nor for exquisite matter such as neuer before was delivered; though his learning I acknowledge and will not but reverence his gifts: but wonderfull his answer is and altogether extraordinary, considering that such incomparable bitterness, disdain, scoffing, reproch, and furious rage doth so abundantly com from him therein against my poore selfe, being yet by the mercy of God a true Christian, a Minister of the Gospel, and one (I praise the Lorde) which ever haue bin carefull to bee free from the standalls of the World. Though herein I boast not, but rather (with the Apostle) will boast of mine infirmities. Verily this now I haue learned by his writing better then ever I conceived before; namely what great oddes he maketh and desireth to be made betwene himselfe a Lord Bishop, and an other being but a Preacher of Gods most holy word. Well: this is the Rhetorike and the ornaments of his Conclusion against my writing. But all this is besides his Matter, which nevertheless may haue peradventure some weight in it. It may peradventure. Wherefore I see a double necessity vying me to reply therunto. First to the end that his exceptions and reasons, (that is to say, his wholl matter) may appeare as better to be so weak and insufficient as indeed they are. Sec: that those uncivil reproches

7

reproches (I will not say vncchristian reuilings) being the beuty and forme of his booke, may appeare to be but the froth of a distempered stomacke, the colour of reason and iust cause which he casteth on it, being taken away. As touching the matter therefore thus I purpose to deale. I will begin with his later Writing, which he calleth a Conclusion, because he mainly directeth it against mee, taking in by the way also all such places & points in the former Treatise as do rightly concerne our matter in hand. Finally, as touching his reproches and cruell words I intend wholly to passe over them, seeing for them neither is he any whit the better, nor my selfe the worse.

The Defence of the Treatise of Christes sufferings against Maister Bilsons Conclusion.

HIS Conclusion (for so he thinketh good to call it) beginneth against me in his page 225. Wherein first he doeth charge me in generall termes that *I flee from the state of the Chiefe question, and overskip his Authorities, in his reasons I forget and dissemble what pleaseth my self, in the defence of my holy cause (as it pleaseth him to mocke) I rone as I list neither keeping any order, nor bringing any matter of moment, confusedly powring out the hasty resolutions of mine own braines spiced euery where with ignorant & absurd positions, proudly despising all authority & antiquitie, &c.* Al which words are but wind, as I shal make it eident (God willing) when we com to view his particulars heerafter insuing. Among which he beginneth to iustifie that he mistooke not his Text when hee preached this doctrine. But I wil speak thereof anon, so that first I satisfie him in the most principal point of his challenge against me: Which is this, "that I haue changed the first questiō, that I set not down the state therof fully nor truly: & so, I offer to prove that which he never denied, I confute that which he never affirmed. Let vs therefore consider advisedly this questiō: which I wil set downe again as exactly & as plainly as I can, that we may see how far I erred fro it before. We affirme That Christ in his Soule suffered all Gods proper Wrath and vengeance being paines and punishment for sinne & no sinne, also as touching the essence or nature thereof, and so farre as was due Generally for all mankind to suffer. His contraty opinion we conceane thus, That Christ suffered for our sinnes nothing els but simply and meerey a Bodily death: altogether like as the god-

The like
saith in
pag. 9.

* Pag.

" Ep.

The
whole
out 1.

" or
his Ho
scion
in an

lie and holy men do often suffer at the handes of persecutors, saving only that God accepted this death of his Sonne as a ransom for sinne, but the death of his servants he doth not.

The Opening of the whole state of this Question.

aine spe-
l things to
noted.

1.

2.

ee kindes
e Soules
ring of
ies. 1.

2.

3.

tions no
ediat nor
r Punish
1.

g. 5. 6. 16
p. 353.

355-335

br. 2. 10.

For the better vnderstanding whereof, we must note these principall things. First that All suffering of Paines in man is frō God: either properly from his Iustice, or from his Holy Love: either frō him alone, or also from his Instruments and inferior meanes. Again, All suffering of Paines is for Sinne either inherent, or imputed: either as Correction, or as Punishment: either immediatly, or mediately: as anon we shall further see. Sec: By the Lawe of our Creation as we are men having a Soule besides our Body, so our Soule hath in it a 3. fold faculty of Suffering Paines. First, that which is *Proper* and *immediat* iustly so called: Proper, because it is proper only to reasonable and immortall Spirites: although in men (if it grow vehement) it affecteth cōsequently the Body also. Immediat 2. wayes: 1. because it can & doth receave an impression of sorrow and Paines made from God only by and in it selfe, without any outward bodily meanes therevnto. 2. It is also an Immediat Punishment, or els Correction of sinne: it cometh not for any other cause at all. So that thus we meane, when we speake of the *Soules Proper and Immediat Suffering*. The Soules second faculty of Suffering paines is not Proper, but *Common* to vs with Beasts: namely that which is by Sympathy & Communion with and from the Body. For which cause also it is not Immediat: sith it cometh not to the Soule but by externall bodily meanes. A third kind of painful Suffering the Soule hath: namely, her vehement & strong *Affectiōs* are Painful, whether they be good or evill. As Zeale, Love, Cōpassion, Pity, Care, &c. Neither are these immediatly for Sinne, whether Punishmentes or Corrections: but they com for and by other immediat causes, neither are they Punishmentes or Corrections at all *Properly* in them selves: *Accidentally* they may be, when they growe so strong that they paine and grieve the Soule. These 2. later kinds of the Soules Suffering you acknowledg to have ben in Christ: the 1. kinde "you utterly deny. Now I affirme that Christ tasted also the 1st kinde. For how could the *Proper* and *principall* Humane Suffering be not in him, a Man made of God to Suffer for all our Sinnes? So this (in a maner) is y point of our Cōtroversie. And verily how you can deny

Deny the same by the Scripture, yet acknowledging withall a true and perfit Humaine Soule in Christ, I cannot see. Namely seeing iust occasion heereof was giuen him from God, as afterward shall further appeare. You * seeme to sticke at those termes which I vse *The Soules proper and immediat suffering*, & you call them "*unsalted and unfeeld*". But any may see how easy they are to bee vnderstood, and also that wee must in this question necessarily thus distinguish the same from that which is by sympathy, & is comon to vs with other creatures. Thirdly wee must also note that God himselfe is alwayes and evermore the principall and proper punisher then when the Soule suffereth paines after the first maner, that is in her *proper and immediat* faculty of suffering. And that is alwayes *immediatly* for sinne also, not for any other cause at all. Gods owne almighty power armed with iustice in burning wrath thus punisheth sinne sometime more sometime lesse, when and how it plealeth him. Fourthly, God himselfe therfore was thus the principall and only proper Punisher of Christ as hee sustayned the punishment of our sinnes. The Diuells and wicked men his Persecutors did their parts also indeed for other ends, but yet they were all as Instruments only, & vsed by God ynto his owne end; namely that Christ might pay heereby a iust price and full satisfaction for our sinnes. It was then the Almighty and most iust God himselfe in his severe wrath against our sin, that principally & properly inflicted on Christ the paines and punishments which he as our Surety suffered for the paying of our Ransom. As it is written, "*The Lord laid vpon him the punishment of vs all*". Whatsoeuer you have against this afterword, we shall consider it in due place. Fifthly we meane not that in God was, is, or can be any *perturbatio* at all, and therefore consequently no *Wrath* nor *Hatred* as is in vs. But because Wee painfully afflict others with whom commonly wee are *Angry*, and we discerne sometime and see paines inflicted on men by God, therefore we say he sheweth his anger and wrath vpon them whom hee punisheth. Nevertheless wee must note especially that to suffer (as the Godly doe) Chastisements and corrections, is not to suffer or feele Gods *Wrath* nor indeed the punishment of sinne: except it bee in a very *vnproper* speech. To suffer the true punishment, satisfaction, proper payment, & wages of sinne, only that is to suffer properly and truly the *Wrath* and

* pa. 248.
" pa. 257.
356.

" Ma 53.

5.
† As you
see
pa. 248.

Curse of God. Now then seeing the paines which Christ for vs did feele, were indeed properly the Punishment and Paiment and vengeance for sinne, such as the Godly do in no wise suffer, Christ only having wholly suffered that for vs all: Therefore indeed his sufferings proceeded from Gods *proper Wrath*, and were the true effects of Gods meere *Iustice* bent to take recompence on him for our offences: the Godly never suffering any thing at all in such respect.

Sixt: These paines which Christ suffered as the proper Punishment and Price of sinne, and inflicted on him even by Gods own hand, did not make smart and anguish only in his flesh, or onely in the sensitive part of the Soule by mutuall coniunction & sympathy with the body, but of necessity must also be deeply conceaved & felt in the vnderstanding and Mind of Christ. Now how deepe this was, as we neither do nor can precisely affirme, so we are well assured that the sense of paine was not lessened nor abated in Christ needlesly: Hee suffered doubles according as sinne deserved in every point, except only in such respects as were flatly impossible. For the better vnderstanding whereof wee are heere to

note another principall distinction: that there are 3. diuers and severall sortes of suffering paines directly for sinne. 1. As the wicked and damned do: that is by suffering the proper wrath of God truly punishing in them (that is properly in their Soules as well as in their Bodies) their sinnes, in whom together with their paines there is also inherent sinne abiding and imputed, (the cause of all their punishments) with the the adjuncts and consequents thereof, desperation, induration, blaspheming, reiection, malediction, hatred, and finall dereliction, with such like. These are certain proper and right conditions of the reprobate heere, & of the damned in Hell, which Christ never tasted.

2. The godly in this world do suffer paines for their sinnes. But these whatsoever they be (yea though death it selfe) are improperly called *Punishments*, as was before noted, they are * *Chastisements* of sinne. Yea they are partly remembrances to cause repentance of sinne past & presently inherent, partly *Chastisements* to humble vs, and to mortifie sinne in vs more and more hereafter. And thus they are in no sort inflicted on vs as very Curses by Gods Wrath and Iustice (properly so called) but properly by Gods Holynes and Love: as after we shall further see. These are the ordinary wayes of suffering for

7.
suffering of
paines for sin
fold.
or sinne in-
herent and
imputed.

or sinne in-
herent but
imputed.

eb. 12. 5.
7. 8. 9. 10.

sinne.

sinne, but nothing appertayning to Christ neither. 3. There is another peculiar and extraordinary way belonging onely to Christ, according to which Christ suffered for sinne: distinct and greatly differing from both the former, and yet in some speciall points agreeing with both. 1. Christ suffered for sinne being sinles indeed, as the Godly also are sinles "by impuration. Againe their sufferings are temporary, and in this life only: such also were his. But Christes sufferings were exceeding much differing from ours, 1 in that his sufferings were for our sinnes now made his by Gods account, and ours are for our owne. Also, his were the true and proper *Punishment* or *iust vengeance* of God for sinne, ours onely *Chastisements* and remembrances, which belonged nothing at all to him. His, the true effects of Gods severe and iust *Wrath* properly taken, ours are from his iustice & wrath *improperly* so called. Touching the Reprobats and damned, 1. their sufferings are for sinnes *inherent*, Christes were for sinnes only *imputed*: So that Gods Anger was not against Christes owne person, but against the sinnes which by his office in his own person he sustayned, the sorrow and paines whereof touched his very person. 2. Their punishments are partly in this life, and partly eternall in the life to come: but Christes were temporary and only in this life. 3. Their sinne being inherent not forgiven and iustly punished, they have all the properties and Concomitants of sinne inherent, never forgiven, but inwrapped in eternall punishments: as these, Desperation, the sting of Conscience, Induration, Reiection, Malediction, Dereliction, &c. But in Christ, where no sinne was inherent nor eternally punished, there could vterly be none of these. 4. They are punished heere, & chiefly in Hell the proper place of the damned heereafter: but Christ suffered onely heere in this life. Lastly their tormētts though everlasting deserue nothing at Gods hands, but Christ though suffering but for a while, deserved infinitely favour and grace for them, for whom he suffered. Howbeit as I said the sufferings of the damned are all one with Christes, as touching the Nature of the punishments and as touching the chiefest causes thereof. First God himselfe was the proper and principall Ordayer, Author and Executor of his punishment, Gods owne hand did it to Christ: no lesse then to the damned. Seco^d Christ having most horrible sinnes imputed to him as the damned haue

3 Suffering
sinne not
herent, but
yet imputed

How Christes
sufferings
those of the
Godly do
gree. How
they differ.

" Rom. 4-7

How the sufferings
of Christ
and of the
Damned
differ.

How the sufferings
of Christ
and of the
Damned
the same.

also, therefore he suffered for them from Gods hand euen as the damned do: namely in these points, which are both possible and reasonable, that is, paines inflicted *immediatly and properly* in the Soule, and not only by outward meanes in the Body. For it is most reasonable and possible that the Soule of Christ should haue our sinne imputed to it, yea principally to it, and not to the Body only, even as wee commit sinne in our wholl manhood, but yet principally in & by our Soule. Which being true that Christes reasonable Soule had sinne imputed principally to it according to that of the Prophet "*He made his Soule sinne*, therefore his Soule principally & peculiarly did suffer *for it*. Also his Soule by nature being capable of suffering from Gods very hand, & an occasion now serving therevnto, because of all our sinnes wholly imputed to him, lastly God himselve standing now disposed to punish and revenge sinne in him so far as he was capable thereof, therefore his punishment for that sinne was *a true, proper, & full punishment* as theirs is, namely as touching meere paines, and was the effect of Gods *proper Wrath, iustice, and vengeance* as well on his Soule, as on his Body; & thus for the time, it was even like as the sufferings of the damned are. For *continuance* of time in paines is not of the nature of Hell paines or of Gods Wrath, nor yet to be in Hell "*locally*, as you wrongly imagin, but meere circumstances ther of only. Thus the very *nature* of punishment for sinne being but the feeling of extreamest paines from Gods hand, whether for a time or for ever, whether locally in Hell or els where, that neither altereth nor lesseneth the present paines, which Gods owne infinit wrathfull power & iustice can inflict for satisfaction where and how it pleaseth him. These paines then to this end, and in this very manner inflicted Christ felt: Indeed not being in the locall Hell, yet those being as wee see the self same paines for their *nature* which are in Hell, yea which are *sharpest* in Hell. And he discerned and receaved them properly, yea only in his very Soule; as then was manifest when his body was so brused with sorrowes and sufferings (yet none at all then touching him without) that there strayned out from him much *sweat of clotted blood, &c.*

These things being thus, now let vs see wherein you agree with vs, and wherein you disagree. We all agree (in termes) *That Christ*

suffered in soule Gods Wrath: howbeit touching the sense we disagree in 2. maine pointes. 1. I affirme that Christ suffered Gods *Proper* Wrath and vengeance: you meane hee suffered only such afflictions as other godly men do suffer at the handes of the wicked and cruell world. For "you thinke all Afflictions whatsoever, small or great, & towards whomsoever are the effects of Gods Wrath. But that is not so: except in a most *improper* speech. To the godly their Afflictions both small and great are Gods Fatherly and gracious Chastisements and no effects of his proper Wrath, as shall appeare further heereafter.

Howbeit you must observe heere my 3. limitations which I set down in the *Question*. 1. I meane he suffered only that proper Wrath of God which was meereely Punishment for sinne, and no sinne. 2. This also hee suffered as touching the Substance and Nature of the Paines, not as touching the Circumstances, either of of Place, or Continuance, &c. 3. I meane hee suffered not every particular Punishment of sinne, nor that which every particular sinner meeteth with all: but the *Generall* Curse and Punishment of God for sinne, namely that which belongeth in Gods Iustice to All men in Common and Generally, who abide in sinne.

Now after these necessary limitations, the 2. maine point wherein we further disagree is this; I affirme that Christ Suffered All Gods proper Wrath and vengeance for sinne, namely so described and limited as is above said. I say All that which the very Damned doe suffer, Christ thus did suffer for vs; and therefore even a Proper and immediat sense in his Soule of Gods Proper & most painfull Wrath, his infinit, and intolerable burning Wrath. Which what tounge is it that can expresse, or heate conceaue. Yet Christs Humane Soule was apt and able to feele it, though not to sustaine it. A iust occasion in him was offered thereunto: for then he stood forth as the only and absolute Ransompayer of all our debts.

And Gods impartiall Iustice dispenseth not without necessity: Yea where he cometh to Punish, he layeth it on finding sinne unsatisfied, as he doth in harlots in the wicked, and as he did imputed in Christ our surety, till he had by † Sufferings accomplished & finished perfirly his Redemptio for vs. But this is far greater then as you hold, that He suffered no more but meere Bodily paines, that is, in his Soule by & fro his Body. This is your drift every where,

The issue
the question
1.

"Page 19

"Before

† Heb
Your A
on w
gainst
Christ
red in
only
fro his

16. but I note these expresse places: * *Sin which should haue wrought in vs an eternall destruction both of Body and Soule could not farther preuaile in him but to the wounding of his flesh and shedding of his blond for the iust & full satisfactiō of all our sinnes, even in the righteous and sincere iudgment of God. Likewise your generall Title is, The Full redemption of mankind by the death and blond of Christ.* So you commend * *the force and frute of his bodily death as most sufficient.* And * *the bodily death of Christ payeth the price of our Redemption, it removeth all the impediments of our salvation* * *The ioynt sufferings of Christ (the Soule feeling what the Body suffered) were most auaylable for our salvation.* * *The violence was offered to the Body, the sense whereof reached vnto the Soule, and these are the sufferings of the Crosse and of death which the Scriptures attribute to the Sonne of God for our salvation.* * *There is no other sacrifice of Christs Soule, which can be neither bodily nor blondy.* * *The iustice of God both temporally and eternally punisheth the Soule only by the Body.*

17. Nevertheless contrariwise you seeme some where to yeeld wholly so much as we affirme. As where you say * *The same part might indeed suffer in Christ which sinned in man, I meane the Soule.* If you meane as you seeme and as you ought, that as every part and faculty of the Soule is in vs sinfull, so in Christ it suffered for our sinne, then in his Soule he suffered for sinne properly and immediately, that is, in his very Mind from the immediat hand of God, & not only from and by his Body. Again you allow in Christ * *All those afflictions and passions of the Soule which naturally and necessarily follow paine, This All reacheth vnto me, and more grievous paines then the more bodily are: it includeth the Soules proper & immediat paines also.* And yet playner: * *Smart, paine and grief of body or mind (bee it never so great) will commend his obedience and patience.* And * *the punishment of sinne which proceedeth from the iustice of God, and is no sinne, that Christ might and did boare: Yea he suffered death* * *with all painfull, but no sinfull concomitants and consequents.* And * *nothing might befall the humane nature of Christ which was unfitting for his Divine.* Whence we gather (vnderstanding you in the best sence) that whatsoeuer was fitting for his Divine nature to admit of in his Humanity, that his humane nature did feele. Consequently then he felt all the paines of the damned

which

which were no sinnes, neither indeed perpetuall: seeing his Divine nature could admitt this in his Manhood aswell as any suffering at all for sinne. You will say, If hee felt not also *desperation* as the damned do, then hee felt not all the paines which the damned do feele: For *desperation* augmenteth their very paines. I answered, we say not that Christ suffered simply All the paines of the damned; that is, He felt not such as are by their very nature sinnes aswell as paines: as indeed *desperation* is. But I say Christ suffered none of those paines. All other which are by their nature meere paines and onely painfull Christ did suffer them as sharply for the time, we doubt not, as the very damned do. So that if your L. will stand to that which before we observed in you, and not clip it, nor renounce it, we professe this is all that ever we did or do craue, wee neede no longer to strieve, it is the wholl question which you grant vs: viz: *That Christ did beare punishment of sinne as great as any is proceeding from the Justice of God, yet being no sinne.* Whence it must needes follow that the paines of Christes suffering were the same in nature and altogether as sharpe and as painfull as they are in Hell it self. And this is the whol summe of the matter about Christes Hellish sorrowes and paines, & thus standeth our question with these differences, according to which we hold and professe that Christ suffered the Wrath of God, or Hell paines.

If you set the question otherwise, you go back from that which you found fault withall in your Sermons, & you fully ioyne with the Preachers and Catechismes of England, yea withall other Protestants in the world; and namely with all them, whom at first you reprov'd and traduced openly for this cause. There is none of them I assure you that ever spake or meant any more then this issue delivereth. If you agree to this, I beseech you what wisdom shewed you in your whot confutations & exclamations, so vehemently to condemne you knewe not what and to reprove you knew not whom. Further, if any do teach that Christ suffered the paines of Hell in a grosse and locall maner, though you most iniuriously do invey ar vs for such a matter, yet verily it is neerer your owne assertion then ours, if you be well observed. For seeing you determine simply, that Christ might & did suffer such punishment of sinne which proceeds from the iustice of God and is no sinne, it seemeth by your speech that Christ did suffer Torments

lyrics:
ult. Lati-
r. Aq.
on.

hold not
at Christ
suffered sin-
the pai-
of Hell.

As also
any other
nts of Re-
on are
ntyme af-
med & v-
ed.

1. 8. 334-
9.

injurious
utation.
1. 8. 344-
17. 364-
19. 341.

reat. 1.
1. 40.

even locally in Hell it selfe: for that had ben a punishment, & that is no sinne, & that in deed some learned and godly men did hold, but erroneously. As for vs somway we avouch your sentence also, that Christ suffered whatsoever punishment of sinne which proceeded from the iustice of God, & is no sinne, but yet with expresse limitation fro Scripture namely in Circūstances, as I shewed, viz. in this world only & not after his cōsole at all, nor locally among the damned. So that thus we say, it is not true *that Christ suffered the paines of Hell*, which yet those your fore-noted infinit wordes doe import. Nay, speaking exactly, wee vse not this terme of Hell, neither delight we to vse it oftē in any regard about our maine Question: because we finde not this word literally and expresse applied to Christs sufferings in the Scripture. Howbeit sometimes we speake so, I graunt, and I thinke that wee may well doe so, when we vnderstand it (by "plaine Consequence fro Scripture) for the extreame paines of Gods proper wrath & vengeance for sinne, from which euen Hell it selfe is not separated; yea Gods very wrath is a parte, and the greatest parte of Hell paines. Or els Metaphorically, when we haue to set out with an emphasis, the most dolefull and incomparable paines of Christs sufferings, as they appeared onely to the sense of men, & not otherwise: Which it seemeth "your selfe also liketh well enough. But howe badly then doe you vrge vpon vs and perswade men that we doe & must say in maintenance of this our Question, *that Christ suffered All the sorrowes of Hell, the whole Curse of God, his whole wrath, and All the very Torments of the damned*, and that in such sense as you make of those wordes, that is including in them, the *Locall Hell, eternall punishment, Diminution of faith, Holines, &c. with Desperation, Rejection, utter darknes, &c.* As for "my wordes which you wrest that way, they are cleared by my Opening this Question both before and after. Wherefore wee plainly tell you, that we desie and detest in our heartes (as well as you) all these blasphemous & wicked thoughtes of the Sonne of God, our most glorious and gracious Releemer. And yet if you had vnderstoode those Phrases, *the whole Curse of God, His whole Wrath, All the sorrowes of Hell* onely touching the sense of *Meere paines*, that Christ feeling the proper wrath and iustice of God punishing him for our sinnes, felt as extreme sharpnes of paines which had no

mixture of sinne, as may in any possibilitie be endured yea though in Hell it selfe; and so a kinde also of *foraking* in them, a kinde of *Carving*, and hatred, and condemnation, and a sense of burning wrath, which he being our high Priest and Sacrifice was appointed vnto, and which payment of ours was by God layed vpon him being our Redcemer, and Ransompayer, & Surety: and that all this he iustayned and suffered for a time in this life so deeply & wofully as was possible for a man any where to suffer which was also wery God. May if this had ben your meaning, we would not then hold it blasphemous nor erroneous, asst you obiect it vnto vs, but the very truth indeed, to say Hee suffered the true paines of Hell, and the wholl wrath of God. Which verily your own words also in some places do imply, yea at least so much, and that manifestly enough, it seemeth, as before I haue observed. But to wade further then this, and to *particularize*, or to specific the parts of Gods wrath which Christ felt, asst you will vs to do, or to shew the manner how, or the certaine measure how deeply he suffered it, what madnes were it in men to attempt, and what folly is it in any to requier. This sufficeth, that we know God is able (as well out of the locall Hell as in it) to reueale and inflict spiritually this wrath where he findeth sinne vnsatisfied, and in Christ the vnion of his Godhead might admit it in his Manhood, & his Soule was capable & apt to discern and feele *immediatly* the impression thereof in it selfe. Now because also God was heere bent to punish all our most horrible finnes in Christ, and he was ordained to receave the same vpon himselfe, and God was never to punish them truly any more, nor any where els, and because of the proportion of Gods exact Iustice which dispenseth not where there is no necessity for dispensation, because also of Christes taking our wholl nature for no needfull purpose at all without this, and lastly by reason of many pregnant texts of Scripture proving by infallible arguments that thus surely it was in this mystery of Christs purchasing our redemption (which you in all your writing have no whit detected) therefore we are vndoubtedly perswaded that this is the very truth of God: Namely asst before I taught, *as touching the* *sharp paine and vehemency of sorrow* that Christ suffered for vs *will and wholly* the wrath of God and his bitter Curse: That is, as *I said before* *possibility would admit*, so *as* he being also wery God,

As in the place I shew. Such as you self explain pag. 245. And as God's Curse is not words, but deeds. pa. 2

Epi. 2: 6

Pa. 245

Treat. 20. 21

Pa. 37

God and a man not possible to sinne, could suffer. Neither is there any peece of reason on your parte for the contrary. And this is much more I trust then to suffer in Soule by *Sympathy* only from and by and with the Body, which as " before I shewed, you plainly do make the only & wholl suffering of Christ for our Redemption: which kinde of suffering all *Godly men* doe suffer also when the wicked in the world do afflict and persecute them. But touching suffering of *Martirs* and *godly men*, it is not intruth, (as t before is shewed) of that kinde as Christes suffering was, and therefore this suffering of the Soule onely by *Sympathy* commeth nothing neere to the sorrowes of the suffering of Christ; which bee suffered from the hand of Gods *offended Iustice*, and *pure Holines*, and *Wrathfull power*, infinitely satisfying it selfe on him for our sinnes which by his office he receaved vpon him selfe, to acquite vs from the same. This no *Martin* nor *godly man* doth, who suffer only as from the malice and rage of men, from God there proceedeth nothing but fatherly chastenings to them, his very wrath indeed for their sinnes appeareth not at all against them, which they know Christ hath once borne and for ever dissolved. You haue wordes in some places, as if you held this difference with vs of Christes sufferings compared with the suffering of *Martirs*: Namely, where you say, "*Christ suffered the wrath of God punishing sinne, not in his Body only, but in his Soule also by some proper punishments of the Soule, as by sorrow, and feare in his Agony, &c.*" Howbeit, though these wordes seeme plaine, yet I perceave ambiguity and fallacy in them, yea also I thinke a great errour. First your fallacy is in that you meane sorrow and feare indeed properly in his Soule, but not any proper Punishment of sinne, nor comming for any paine or smart that he felt inflicted for sinne, but it was meere "*Devotion to God, & Love, pity, & compassion towards men*:" Which say you, could not be without some *feare, and zeale, and griefe*. That is true: but this is a notable fallacy. For many thinke that you meane, Christ suffered such sorrow and paine as was both proper to the Soule, and was the proper punishment of sinne also. But then had you heerein fully agreed with vs. Nowe that *Religious Devotion*, and *Pity* are properly partes of Christes *Holines* and *nigh confusions* not of his sufferings for sinne. For these 2. parts of Christes *Mediation* I trust you will distinguish. And

Pag. 13. 14

Pag. 8. 11.

and therefore
they are so
secrefull at
their Death,
then Christe
his extreme-
sorrowfull.

Pag. 248

Pag. 257

Pag. 24. 25.

Pag. 144. 290

godly and
tuous Al-
tions.

Pag. 147

1602

3

simply

surely Christs Agonie, was properly a part of his most bitter *Passion*, not of his *Obedience and Righteousnes*: albeit even in suffering also he was perfectly obedient. Thus then you are never the neerer to the truth in this point for all your seeming. Againe considering what you write of the wrath "of God which the Godly generally do suffer, you seeme to me to thinke that every Martirs death and all the crosses and griefes both of body and minde in the godly are very * punishments of sinne, and right effects of Gods Iustice and wrath taking properly vengeance on them for sinne in such maner as he doth on the Reprobat, though not in such measure: and that such likewise were Christs sufferings. But then I deny that therein yow have the truth, or have rightly expressed the sufferings of Christ, or of his Saintes. Because the sufferings of the Saintes are properly not punishments for sinnes, nor effects of Gods wrath properly, but are indeed fatherly & profitable chastisements purpose-ly inflicted by God for their good, as before is said. But Christes were altogether of another nature and condition, they were *the only true and proper punishment, price, Satisfaction, and Ransom for sinnes*, as hath ben also noted before, & after shall be further shewed. If you vnderstand Christes suffering Gods Wrath to be such as the godly feele, viz: *improperly and largely* (as the Scriptures there do meane) and not as the very price and punishment for sinne, but only as Chastisements, then that is likewise manifestly ynttrue.

Also then againe for your words you are ambiguous and decept-ful in this issue: which kinde of vandy you commonly vse in all other your handling of controversies since you left writing against the *Papistes*, as who so looketh shall see. For wee affirming that Christ felt the wrath of God doe meane it properly, as it inflicteth properly the punishment and Wages of sinne; and you tell vs that he suffered Gods wrath as the *Saintes and Godly men* doe suffer it: That is, altogether *unproperly*, beeing sometime so called for a certain *seeming* that it hath to bee so (as you acknowledge) in the sense of flesh and blood. Then what is this to our purpose? What els do you worke herrein but deceipt & mistaking to the Reader through the ambiguity of this word *the Wrath of God*. Which probable fallacy of yours is so plaine, that I need not stand to open it any further: and yet I assure my selfe that this is the very ground and fountaine of the error in this Question. Which if a man marke

"Pa. 130, 2
131. 346. 2

* For you
make God
Wrath in-
ferent to
men who
afflicted.

† In your
131.

Your Equi-
cation in
terme G
Wrath.

Your Equi-
location.

As you seeme
to meare pa.
at. 105.

et deny at
ence, y Mens
chaules have
my sense in y
minde, be-
sides y Com-
s sense de-
ending on
the Body.

Pag. 157.

Propositi.

well & distinguish as he ought and may easily do, he shall quickly drive you either to shift into this " corner, or ells to deny much of that which you affirme in your booke elsewhere. Therefore lett the wise consider it. Neverthelesse if happily you meane other-
 wife, that is, that Christes very " outward sufferings and bodily death were in a peculiar sort the effects of Gods *proper* wrath thus truly punishing our sinnes on him, then in effect you come to vs againe, of yow will sticke but to this. For there is no reason in the worlde to make Christes flesh subiect to Gods Curse for sinne, and not his Minde and soule likewise. Also wee must note that such outward bodily sufferings beeing indeede punishments and not chastisements for sinne, that is *proper effects* of Gods very wrath and iustice comming to take vengeance for sinne, they cannot be *meere bodily* sufferings, nor meerly felt by sympathy in the Soule, which is the proper effect of the *outward* sensitive facultie only, but they must of necessity be conceived, discerned, & applyed in the *inward* feeling of the Minde of Christ, and will make a singular and secret impression of sorrow in the Soule far above all *meere bodily* griefes, beyond all measure and proportion of things in ordinary experience, & so exceedingly differing from all other sufferings in this life. Which therefore may iustly bee termed *the proper and immediat sufferings of his Soule*. And this sense the Lord doubtles revealeth vpon men sometime more sometime lesse in this life, even as it pleaseth him. Which also befell vnto Christ.
 Againe, if the Agonie and sorrow which " you grant Christ suffered simply in his minde, be meant by you to have ben as it were a " foretast of *such* sufferings and a *fear* or dread of them (as very iustly it may be) considering the weake disability of a Creature to stand vp against the Creator, namely now shooting or preparing to shoote presently the sharpe arrowes of his *wrath* vpon him for our sinnes, in which case and condition Christ now stood for that while: then I say also I see in effect no difference betwene vs, then againe this Question is (as it were) at an end. For doubtles he suffered at one time or other the same thing which he *so feared*. Yes such a kind of *fearing* cannot be but a mighty suffering thereof. Neither doe wee contend to expresse what iust measure of Gods *wrath*, nor precisely in what manner it was revealed and executed on Christ. Onely wee know that whatsoever it were, Gods *wrath* and proper *vengeance* for sinnes through outwardly

ted on the Body, yet it could not but sinke in deeper, even into the depth of the Soule, and be discerned by Christ and conceived to be such, and so sustayned as proceeding from God, and so wound the Soule properly, yea chiefly, though the anguish thereof bruized his body iointly also. Againe whatsoever you wil call it, *All* or * part of Gods proper Wrath and vengeance (as it proceeded from him) was incomprehensible, vnspeakeable, infinit, and vntolerable to any creature, & therefore so it was vnto the very *Manhood* of Christ, namely when the Godhead for a season concealed it self of purpose and with held his wonted supportation and comfort from him, to the end that his bitter *Passion* ordayned of God and most voluntarily vndertaken by himselfe, might bee in suffering the "sorrows and paines which were due to vs, nothing qualified, but in all severity accomplished. As indeed when his *Hour* was come and gon it was. As touching that terme *The death of his Soule*, which you stumble at, we shall speake thereof heereafter in due place.

Thus far I have proceeded in opening the true state of this *Question*: which whether you (who have begot to avouch the contrary) will now acknowledge and approve, or not, I know not. Overthrow it, I trust you shall never with all the cunning and strength you have. For vndoubtedly it is, and so will appeare by the word to be a manifest truth, and therefore " will prevaile: besides that it is expressly the doctrine taught and established by authority in England as heereafter God willing I shall plainly shew, notwithstanding all your strange cōtradicting & traducing thereof. Lastly whether I did set down this very state of the question in full effect in my former *Treatise*, or whether I *changed* it (though indeed I graunt I was there much shorter then I am heere) I pray you looke & consider againe in that my [†] first booke. This being well considered and marked, will yeeld vs an easier passage through the rest behind.

To com then to that which hee first * beginneth with: where he laboureth very much to shew that hee mistooke not his Text wherupon first he groundeth his doctrine. This I say, that " this " *Thou* whereon he [†] groundeth and setteth downe the doctrine of " *that* *hol* *metitious* *contents* *of* *Christes* *Crosse*, as likewise of " *that* *affliction* thereof which he in his *Treatise* handleth, I am persuaded

* Such a p
as wante
nothing
whol. but
finfull Ad
rents onl

" The m
Paines
rowes de
fin were
Christ for
time not
qualified
lessened

" Ad. 5

† Pag. 33. and

* Pag. 2

" Gal.

pag. 1.

* Pag. 1

† Pag. 4

Gal. 4. 11.

Pag 117

swaded is mistaken, and that this place of Scripture intendeth not these things. It is manifest that the Apostle^s heere reproveth the false teachers for mingling the pure doctrine of the Gospell because they were loth to tast persecution, which then followed the true and sincere professors thereof: And so encourageth the godly to beare all Afflictions for this persecuted truth and for Christes sake. Thus the *Crosse of Christ* here signifieth I grant *Christ crucified*, *Christ afflicted*, *Christ persecuted*: not in his owne person only, but also in his members. Hee doth heere jointly together vnderstand by Christs Crosse, the afflictions of the *Whole mysticall Body* of Christ both Head and members, which they commonly have in the world. Which many shunned euen with Shipwracke of sincere Religion, but *Paul* reioyced therein so much, as in no worldly ioy like to it. For so he meaneth when he saith, *God forbid that I should reioyce but in the Crosse of Christ*: not that hee makes it a thing detestable to reioyce in any thing els, as "you imagine him to do. It is lawfull to reioyce in other things besides the *Crosse of Christ*: but it is not lawfull to reioyce in any worldly ioy so much, or we are not to reioyce in comparison of our ioy which we ought to haue in this our *shame and afflictions* sustained for Christ, for his Seruants, and for the purity of the Gospell. *Paul* had very great cause thus exceedingly to reioyce heerein. For 1. this was a token to men that he walked in the perfit way, and a meanes also to himselfe so to doe. 2. Because this his doing rebuked the corrupters and minglers of the Religion who would sustaine in the world no disgrace which followed the sincere course: & he thus encouraged also the weake professors to suffer willingly for the same. 3. This indeed *Crucified the world vnto him and him vnto the world*, as still it doth vs also. These causes are both evident in the text and sufficient for *Paul* so exceedingly to reioyce in suffering for the pure Gospell. Now hee cannot heere respect the meritorious and propitiatory Contents of Christs Crosse, and so make it detestable to reioyce in any thing els as propitiatory besides this suffering heere exprest (which is the sense that you give vnto it) I say, this *Paul* cannot respect in this Word, if hee include his own & the Godlies afflictions. But it appeareth by what before, that indeed he doth include them: & all the circumstances immediately following do also declare it. 1. That which I moued before

before, By suffering in the world for Christ, for his simple truth, & Church sake, the *world was Crucified to him, and he indeed unto the world.* Also another reason sheweth it: † For in Christ Iesus neither circumcision nor vneircumcision avayle any thing, but a new Creature. That is a sincere & vpright conversation being the fruit of a sincere and pure faith and profession: which matter hee nameth a little before "Faith working by loue. So by this Fruit he encourageth men (as I said) though there com shame and trouble therewith. Also in the next place thus, * And as many as walke according to this rule (both of pure profession and conversation) peace shalbe vpon them &c. howsoever in the world they have shame and trouble. Lastly † hee willeth that no good Christian heerafter should put him to busines by seeking resolution of him, whether (for the pretended peace of the Church) vnprofitable Ceremonies should be retayned with the Gospel: for so saith he my example sheweth you all my minde, *I beare about me the marks of the L. Iesus, that is Afflictions for the sincere truths sake, which I could by policy and wisdom avoyd aswell as those corrupters of Religion, if I had no more care of the sincerity of the Gospell then they have.* This being thus, it cannot be possibly that the Apostle should heere minde to name the particular kindes and all the meritorious partes or Contents of Christs suffering in this place: but only hee encourageth men (as I said) to indure all afflictions for Christ and his truth sake. Thus you are answered also in that * you deny the Crosse of Christ in Scriptures to be taken for the Afflictions of the godly. You see the Apostle " heere calleth the Afflictions of the godly *the marks of the Lord Iesus: also the afflictions of Christ* in another place. And in another " *the dying of the Lord Iesus.* What are these in truth but the *Crosse of Christ*, vnlesse you imagin some mysterie in the diuers wordes, when apparantly the matter is all one. Also the very worde *Crosse* a little before signifieth the Shame and hatred of Christ slaine on the Crosse together with the shame of his Seruants. And thus also " your maine objection is answered, where you argue that Paul cannot be vnderstood " to say that those false teachers would not suffer persecution for the Afflictions of the godly. He may be vnderstood to say, that he would not suffer persecution for commending the Afflictions and shame of good Christians for Christs sake, which they ought

* Which
your pre
Text vii
† v: 15.

" Gal. 5.

" v: 16.

† v: 17.

* Pag. 29

" ver. 29

" Coll. 1.

" 3 Cor.

* Gal. 5.

" Pag. 29

" ver. 12.

ought to have done. Then what sense or reason wanteth this exposition? I knowe the roote and originall of their Hatred and disdain was against Christ himselfe, & namely for his ignominious death on the Crosse. But this excludeth not, indeed it includeth in the *Crosse of Christ* Christs members the faithfull which are his owne Body, and so consequently all their Afflictions for Christs sake. Which the wicked and corrupt professors, I say, wil not commend (as Paul did) by suffering persecution in their own persons, they will not by Suffering win credit and reverence to that way in the world. The Fathers which "you bring hereabout overthrow not this sense but iustifie it rather. Wherefore you cannot avoyd it yet, but that it is still an oversight in you to vnderstand heere, by the *Crosse of Christ*, the Contents of his sufferings and to note his wholl and intire Passion in every part thereof as he merited thereby for vs, which evidently the Apostle intendeth not, neither is he about that in this place. You say, "*you drew no reason from these words of your Text, but proposing them for your theme tooke occasion fro them to lay down first the Contents, then the Effects of Christs Crosse.*" Indeepe such handling of Texts is to vsuall in these dayes, but no good nor commendable vse: that is, to take occasion from any text to speake of any thing. Which practise in you so great a man as you are, and seeme among vs to be, is so much the worse, as there are many younger Divines who are led by example more then reason, that will thinke it a point of learning and wisdom even to do like you. But I for my part do suppose that they are the faithfulllest and wisest handlers of Scripture, which make their Text the ground of all they speake, and doe conclude even from their text firmly and first of all, whatsoever they teach afterwards further therevpon. Els wherevnto servert the taking of Texts in Sermons? If choise Texts may be vsed only to take occasion by them to speake of things evidently of an other sute, and to another purpose then in the Text is meant, sure it may then be iustly charged against vs that we do much wrong to the Scriptures, and do make of them such an instrument as they ought not to be. Lastly it is a strong presumption that you have never a good place in al the Scripture for your opinion, seeing even your choise Text affordeth not any the least reason to helpe it with all; which your selfe heere confesseth, or els why drew you not this reason

Pa. 229

Pa. 226

(such)

(such as it is) from your text to your purpose. But to gratifie you a little, suppose if you will that your Text is not mistaken by you, but that the Apostle intended heere to note the Contents of Christs Crosse. We are to remember then how you "expresly grant, that also the proper *Sufferings of the minde* may rightly be in the Contents of his Crosse. But thus can * your maine opinion bee good, that Christs *Bodily Sufferings alone* were the full price of our Redemption? Which also if you would ground generally on all the Fathers: though very vntruly as afterward God willing we shall see. And to shew the absolut fulnes of this only, you say " *More wee can not aske or expect; and what more can be required, I verily cannot coniecture.* Howbeit your selfe admitteth *more*, even the sufferings of the *minde* simply as I noted: and thus your own selfe by your very Text overthroweth your selfe in the first entrance, as all men may see. And heere mee thinkes also you should not so reprove with contempt as * you do, that which † I noted, that Christs Soule in a large sense might be said to be *Crucified*, & not his Body only; namely if we suppose this your text to signify the Contents of Christs Crosse. For you know that the " *wholl Contents* must be then signified, not any part of them excluded. Finally where you say, * *the Apostle heere maketh it a detestable thing to reioyce in any things els but in the Contents of Christes Crosse*, in saying *God forbid that I should reioyce but in the Crosse of Christ*, either this your speach is to lavish, or els you quite overthrow your 2. Question, That Christ after this *went down into Hell*. For either in Hell Christ hath got vs no purchase, nor wrought vs any further riddance from Sathan then hee had don before, which thing you with great and mighty words * do proclaime that he did, but altogether without shew of reason or likelyhood. For if he did, were it a *detestable thing* for vs (thinke you) to reioyce therein? Or els of necessity you must extend the Contents of Christes Crosse that is his bitter sufferings beyond his death, even vnto his being in Hell also among the Divells and Damned spirits, whither hee went as you say. But this sequele I thinke you will not defend. These iarrs in your selfe therefore you must reconcile: in the meane time men will thinke that you have not handled your Text indeede very rightly.

Then proceeding forward you still shew a bad minde in you
D towards

* Pag. 4

* Pa. 5. 16.

60. 253. &c.

bove pa.

† Pag. 335

* Pag. 64

* Pa. 335.

† In my

Treat. pa.

* Pa. 4.

357. 24.

* Pag. 22

* Pa. 335

Pag. 119.

Pag. 149.

Pag. 115.

48. Epist.

a. 6. 9.

Calvin,
Ber. Mar-
Beza,
Gemellius,
Schelius, &conly true
of reading
ned men
asks of re-
da.

towards me, seeking forthwith even in the entrance to draw me without cause into hatred for "*disdayning* the Fathers, as you suppose. The direct and expresse occasion to speake of this matter commeth not in place till * long after: but you cannot forbear to procure me ill will so long, as it seemeth. What then is my *contempt* and *disdaine* of the Fathers, which you often report in sundry places, and as odiously as is possible? What is my *insolent* dealing against them? Surely I beleeve you can not tell. Happily it is, because I follow not their Authorities in som opinions of Religion, nor in divers expositions of Scripture. Indeed so " you call the Fathers iudgements many times namely *Authorities*; that the world might conceive their words to be warrants vnto vs, & good *Authorities* to rest on in matters of Religion. If you had not this drift in your minde, why give you them such a title, which to mee seemeth somewhat *insolent* indeed? And why do you so hatefully blame me for leaving their opinions sometimes: which so far as I know is never, but when strong reason out of the very Scripture doth lead me from them. And that which I say of the *old*, I vnderstand also of the *new* Writers. Whom indeed I do equally esteeme, and do iudge them (I meane * many of them) except only in *Antiquitie*, otherwise no way inferiour to the best of the Ancients, yea happily in true learning, soundnes of Religion, cleere interpretations on the text, many times before them. Which I hope is no singularity in me so to thinke; but I know it to be that, wherein very many learned and godly Christians do concur. Of all therefore that are learned men whether *new* or *old* thus I esteeme, thus I professe, that they are to bee reade and revered as very good helpes to shew vs som light, and to sharpen our iudgments in the vnderstanding of Scripture, but no further. Their opinions either in *opening* of Texts or in *conclusions* of Religion wee ought not to receave without examining. And wherewith must wee examine them, but only with the *written word*. Gods most holy word is *Allsufficient* in it selfe for all true Religion, or for any part thereof for ever. Thus it was before the writings of men were published, and thus it is now since they are published, and so shalbe for ever. Even for matter, Abundant, and for giving light to the right conceaving & vnderstanding thereof, Allsufficient. So that mens writings do nothing els but helpe to give a greater measure of ca-
lines

lines to their vnderstanding, which yet neuertheles being vsed as God hath appointed them to be, are sufficiently easy and lightsom in them selues. I thinke the H. Ghost much commendeth those *men of Berea*, who hearing the Apostle Paul teach, though they were not ill affected towards him, yet they would not believe that he spake touching Religion, till they had examined by the Scriptures & seene, whether the truth were so as he vttered. I trust then no aduised Christian will challenge more authority to the Fathers then was heere given to the Apostle, nor deny indeede to any priuat men, much lesse to a minister, to iudge and discern in themselves not only of the words of men, but euen of the sense & meaning of the Scripture by the Scripture it selfe, which thing heere the Berzans did, and are commended by the H. Ghost for it. How vniustly then do you charge me that *"I refuse the Fathers to testify in any cause against my liking.* I hope you will not deny me to iudge of this by the Scripture according to that measure of knowledge and diligence which the Lord inableth me with. It is every Christians duety as we haue seene, and you take it vnto your selfe, as we shall see afterwards. Wherefore let others partake with you, I pray, in this common right and Christian liberty. Vnles you thinke so well of your selfe, as to imagine that other men will not be so modest and humble minded in vsing this their freedom, or not so wise, and circumspect as your selfe are. Which conceit if you haue you ought to correct it. Neither yet are the Fathers refused, as you complaine, *to testify in any cause of Religion whatsoever.* By vttering their opinions they may witness what was held and esteemed as true or probable by *some* godly and wise men in those times, but not by all. Mr Bilson himselfe *"elsewhere saith well heereof, If all the ancient Bishops (such were the Fathers, or most of them which we haue extant) should hold an opinion, yet it followeth not that all Preachers then were of that minde, nor if the Preachers generally thought so, that all the Christians were so perswaded.* Thus it is true, they can witness what was held by *some* good men then, as I said, yea perhaps what was commonly thought in the Churches of those places where they lived. But in no wise what was the iudgment of *all* no not among themselves, much lesse every where and in all ages. Now if you should meane yet further, that they may *testify in causes of Religion, as witnesses*

*" Act. 17.
13.*

** Phil. 1. 8
psal. 119.
1 Cor 2.
1 Cor. 10*

" Pag. 14

*" In his
booke
the lesse
part. 2.*

do with vs in Civill matters, that what they affirme and testifie must obtaine a verdict, and so haue sentence and iudgment with it, which in effect you seeme to insinuat by calling their Opinions *Authorities*, so vsually as you do; then indeede for my part I can not agree that they or any men should be such *Witnesses*, nor their words (nor shew of reasons) in any matters of Religion to be taken as *Authorities*. If you or any think otherwise, wee may lawfully deny it. Gods worde only with vs hath indeede *Authoritie*. The Fathers, all, or som haue none any further, then that their Conclusions, expositions, and reasons, if after examination made by the liuely word they be found currant with the Text, then they are the more ioyfully to be embraced. If otherwise in our conscience they seeme to vary from the text, or from some certaine evident Circumstance thereof, then is it not indifferent for vs, but our Christian duty in the presence of God, to leaue them and not to follow them therein: yet still with reverence and loving regard towards their names for the manifold graces of God otherwise in them. More then this whosoever ascribeth vnto them, they verily abuse the Fathers, and not we. For as the Papists do abuse the Saints deceased by Worshipping and praying vnto them, not we who loue them and thinke reverently of them as the blessed Servants of God: So in this case, we who vse the writings of godly Men as good helpes to our knowledge do not despise them, but you who make them *Authorities* in Religion, by your to much imbracing them do indeede notably abuse them.

Nevertheless I well perceave that all this great shew of cleaving to the Fathers iudgments is but coloured in you; you vrge them in som cases so wholy but for advantage. For in other points againe we see when they speak not to your liking, the case is altered. It is worth the paines to looke a little further in to this your practise, because you pursue me with such cruelty for leaving the Fathers in som things. First your generall speeches somewhere of the Scripture and of the expositions of men, are very good. Touching the Scriptures, "*In Gods causes let Gods booke teach vs what to beleue and what to professe.*" What I read in the word of God that I beleue, what I read not that I do not beleue. Touching men, "*If you want the foundation of true faith and religion (the Scripture) vaine do you sick to make a shew of Catholicisme &c.*" Que man

Ep. p. 9.
ag. 41.
booke 1. 2.
last the le-
ts part. 4.
g. 160.
ag. 101.

With truth is a warrant against all the World. Again, "By their patience their expositions must not looke to bee Canonically in the church of God. If they say any thing well, we take it with their praise, if otherwise as men they misse their marke, we refuse it with their leaves." God hath called us unto liberty, "not to be servants of men: and to serve erroneous constructions is worse then to beare tyrannous exactions. These are very worthy speeches; but haue a care and conscience (Sir) I pray you in this, that you leave this freedom vnto vs, which you take to your selfe. Binde no heavier burdens on the Church of God, then your selfe professeth to like of. And because I would haue this sound profession of yours to be wel noted of all men, in as much as I know how waucting and slippery you are for the most part heerein, therefore it is good also that we observe how your owne practise concurrerh heerewith, and ratifieth your profession when and where you list, though when you will, you check and taunt vs for the like Christian liberty. I see in this booke where you forsake the ancient and learned Fathers, that is as you speake in my case, where you contemne and despise them. First you reiect Austens opinion, *that those who rose to life at Christs Resurrection, dyed againe.* Sec: You reiect his exposition of those words of Christ to the Theeves *This day shalt thou bee with mee in Paradise.* Austen vnderstandeth Christ as speaking of the Theeves soule, and his owne "Divine presence in Paradise. But you refuse that, because "wee have no warrant in the word of God to fasten Christs Soule vnto Hell for the time of his Death, that it might not be in Paradise before he descended to Hell. Third: You "renounce Austen and (as he saith) almost all the Church thinking that Christ loosed Adam and som others whom he thought good out of the paines of Hell, wherein till his going thither they were held. Fourth: Against all the Fathers: you affirme it to bee more then manifest that Christ did not fetch the Patriarches out of Limbo Patrum, a certaine region of rest vnder the earth, as they generally thought. Fifth: "You renounce diuers Fathers opinion that "none do go into Heaven till after the last Judgment.

Thus we observe your liberty in leaving the Fathers when you see cause. Why deny you vnto vs the like? If we bring not as good reason to dissent as you do, whensoever we vary from them; let vs heare of it, and beare the blame iustly. This only we desire that in

" In this
3. booke
Full rede-
tion &c.
122.

" Gal. 5.
" 1. Cor.

7.
" Pag. 21
2.

" Also
He is re-
in it, No-
nim ip-
in celo-
rus er-
mo Ch-
Iesu.
" Pag. 21

3.
" Pa. 190

4.
" Pa. 122
300.

5.
" Pa. 122

" None
Martyr
will.

any case of Religion the bare custom of times, the opinion of men, and authority meerely Humane should never barre vs from receaving the simpliciry and evidence of the truth concerning vs which appeareth in the Scripture. But now, that we may proceede, let vs see your speciall *examples*, wherein you will make it manifest that "*I have despised the Fathers*"

pag. 229.

pag. 229.

pag. 7.

pag. 229.

Heb. 4. 15.

Pag. 230.

Neither yet
his flesh ly
he Grave
hout possi-
ty to cor-
otherwise
n as his
es possibly
d not be
cen.

First, * where you say out of certaine Fathers, That Christ in his dying gaue vp his Spirite "*miraculously*," *no violence of Death wresting it from him as it doth ours*, but when hee saw his time hee even at an instant laid it downe of himselfe, no paines hastening his death. Contrary to this I alleaged the Scripture, "*He was like vs in all things sinne only excepted*. To answer this * you reply, Was he like vs in his birth? Can we lye in the Grave without corruption, as "*he lay*? Or raise our selves from death as hee did? Which poore answer I wonder to see comming from you. Aswell you might shew further, He was not like vs in that he walked upon the water, nor in that he fasted 40. dayes, nor in that he knew the secrets of mens hearts, nor in that he turned water into wine, and with a word healed all diseases &c. These things don by his Manhood yet were they the proper effects of his Godhead: they were no naturall but supernaturall thinges. But this text to the *Hebrues* saith onely of naturall Humane properties and infirmities, that Christ in them was altogether like vs, *sinne excepted*. Also this maner of Dying whereof we speake, that is, by sore wounds and blowes, by sharpe outrages, and deadly paines to draw neerer and neerer to Death, is a meere naturall infirmity, and incident to all men. Therefore surely in this very maner did Christ dy also, like as all men vse to do in such case. Againe those Divine effectes which you mention are iustly beleevd to haue bene in Christ. Why? Because of the expresse Scripture that * witnesseth the same. Let mee see expresse words in the text that he Dyed as you say, not naturally, but *Miraculously*, and then will I beleevue it also. You cite certain places, by which you would prove it, As "*No man taketh my soule from me*, but *I lay it downe of my selfe*, &c. Hee meaneth heere that his Death was meere voluntary, freely vndertaken, and willingly of his owne accord perfourmed with such naturall and ordinary infirmities as belong to a man. As you confesse forth where, "*So that so dy even in Christ, was infirmity, though voluntary*. Heere then

2. 23. 24.

2. 27.

m. 1. 3. 4.

h. 10. 18.

h. 10. 18.

g. 161.

Christ

Christ denyeth that hee suffered any thing as forced on him by constraint & violence; but he sheweth that himselfe was altogether willing even to Dy for his people: which also "you plainly see. How will you hence conclude, Ergo He dyed *miraculously*, & not by any fayling of the strength of nature in him notwithstanding all his most intolerable sorrowes and paines? This is truly a *miraculous* argument. As for *Chrysostom* whom * you cite heere-
 vpon, he hath nothing for this point. Though it were new & not ordinary that Christ a man should haue power to lay down his life and power to take it againe, yet why may not his manhood dy naturally notwithstanding. But you will conclude this better. If I deny (you say) *this that Chrysostom saith*, I must remember what God himself saith, "O foole this night shall they fetch away thy soule from thee. I remeber it well. What then? Ergo Christ saying, *None taketh my life from me, &c.* meant that he would dy *miraculously*, and not by the fayling of nature in him. If this be the reason, as I take it to bee, verily I grant it is marvellous subtile and past my reach. Further * you cite, that " *when Iesus had tasted the vinegar, he said, All is finished, and bowed the head, and gave up the Ghost.* What proverth this? Surely that at last after long and sore anguish of minde and bodily torments his naturall strength fayled him, & therefore he bowed his head and gave up the Ghost. What miracle is there in this? But *Barnard* saith, *this proverth plainly an infinit power.* Which doth? *His tasting the vinegar*, or his saying, *it is finished*, or his *bowing the head*, or his *giving up the Ghost*. For my part I can not yet see any *infinit power* in any of these. Wherefore I can not rest on *Barnard* heere; except you for him do finde out som other point in the text to prove plainly an *infinit power* shewed openly in the maner of the Death of Christ, which yet I see not. Give me leaue to refuse the Fathers in such a case, which your selfe doth, as we saw before. Then you alleage that * *Iesus cryed with a loud voyce*, a little while before he dyed: *to shew himself* "say you, " *to be free from any touch of death.* How are you sure of that? What Scripture saith so? Or is there absolut necessitie in reason that it must be so? Questionles none at all. Is it a thing not possible that Christ should cry *aloud*, saying *Father into thy hands I commend my Spirit*, and even anon after dy; and yet nature to haue ben weaker in him, and so himself neerer to death now at last; then he was before

" pag. 112

" pag. 130.

" Luc. 12.

" pag. 7.
" Ion. 19.

" Luke 23.

" pag. 7.

before in the beginning of his Passion. Let all wise men iudge. If this be not possible I will acknowledge mine errour. Adde heere vnto that experience sheweth (as Physitians say) how som diseases in the Body bring Death presently after most strong and violent crying: namely in som excessiue torments, as of the Stone, &c. Where in through extreeme paines and torments the vitall Spirits being dissipated will bee vterly extinct sometimes, before they can recover and gather againe togeather. Thus a man having good strength and force in his Body, when such a disease resteth not neere the principall partes of nature originally, it seemeth hee may notwithstanding by violence of paine onely giue vp the Ghost at a suddaine, yet not miraculously, but by the course of nature only. But * *Ierom* saith, "this was a great wonder, and that therevpon the Centurion confessed, *truly this man was the Sonne of God*. I deny not but Christ might shew som strang & vnusuall thing apparantlie to the beholders in vterring his last voice, when he cryed *Father into thy hands I commend my Spirit*. Which might also very much move the beholders and hearers. And yet it shall not follow that Death seized vpon him not naturally, or not by the fayling of natures strength in him. I say, this may be acknowledged: and yet verily there is no necessitie at all to yeeld even this, for any thing that the text noteth. Yet *Ierom* layeth the Centurion was moved with this great wonder. It is strange that you should persist to vrge *Ierom* heerein against the plaine text in another place: which saith "When the Centurion saw the Earth quake and the thinges that were don, he said, *Truly this was the Sonne of God*. Heere it is expresly noted, that the * *Earthquake* chiefly with other apparant miracles there mentioned, or els the *Earthquake* with the the iniuries of the Persecutours and the innocency and patience of Christ persecuted, compared togeather, did move the Centurion to confesse and say, *Truly this was the Sonne of God*. Heere it is plaine then that not Christes crying in those tormentes was such a wonder, or that the Centurion was by reason thereof moved to acknowledge Christ to be the Sonne of God, as *Ierom* collecteth I know not from what ground, but those other sights before said. Last of all *Austin* is "brought to prove this matter, but with no more strength of reason by the Scripture then the former. Neither can his words indeed being granted, necessarily

pag. 7.
Ad Hedib.
quest. 8.

Mat. 27. 54.

ver. 51.

pag. 8.

ily conclude any thing for your purpose; which as seemeth do shew nothing but Christs voluntary dying, and that at his death he shewed *great power* and not infirmity only. Who denyeth these things.

Then he proceedeth to shew my disdain to the Fathers further: namely for such "*insolent reiecting* all their opinions touching the causes of Christs Agonie in the Garden, and of his complaint on the Crosse. These supposed causes are alleaged and amplified in the former parte. For answer, first I desire to know whether you allow of all these *causes*, or not, you seeme to refuse them heere: for heerein *you shewed not your owne opinion, but the iudgements of the Fathers*. Ellwhere, "*your selfe are resolute* for som of these causes, and against other som. And yet before, "*All these interpretations* (you say) *are sound, and stand well with the rules of Christian piety*. Thus variable you are, in that wherein you seeme most *resolute*. Howbeit in my minde, where you deny these to bee your opinions, there you are in the best opinion. Neither indeede to tell you plaine can I be of opinion that those their iudgements are true. The reasons of my dissenting were touched in my former Treatise, and are maintayned further heereafter, as very sufficient and iust. How then I pray you do I *insolently reiect* the Fathers if heerein I dissent from them iustly, which even your selfe also doth in sundry of them? But my maner of speech is *insolent* perhaps, because I say such collections are absurd and vnlikely. I answer, these my words are purposely meant of those in these dayes that delight to vaunt of the Fathers, and chiefly in their errors. For seeing these opinions themselves are vnttrue, though some of the Fathers inclined after them, yet such in our time as vrge them cannot but bee absurd and strang teachers. Who having so many helpes and meanes to discern where the Fathers mistooke, which they vtterly wanted and we abound with all, yet do so little profit by them, that even great Doctours as they desire to bee thought, see not so much in the truth of the Gospel as many younger men now perceave: and in the Fathers they make themselves so cunning that commonly their sound doctrine they little regard, their faults only they admire. Such I meant and tooke for absurd gatherers from this Scripture. Whom heere I noted by the name of *our Contraries*: The Fathers I call not so. Now that this indeed

Christ's sub-
mission.
to Jewes re-
surrection.
Churches
dispersion.
c. pa. 17. &

37.
Great. 1.
pg. 68.

pg. 6.

pg. 231

pg. 20.

pg. 231.

pg. 34.

pg. 21.

may be also scene even in your expounding heere. Consider first, how you wavered and spake cōtrarily in these "supposed *Causēs*, as I noted a litle before. Again, these agree not with any Circumstances of the *Passion*, and so are merely of Humane coniecture without all Scripture; also they agree not togeather among themselves. One of them crosseth another; one overthroweth an other. Will you then avouch them, as you do, to be "all sound and to stand well with the rules of *Christian piety*? Howbeit absolutely "I deny not, but that these or some of these reasons were in Christ at his *Passion*, as namely *his Care for his Church; his love of his enemies, &c.* For these holy affections hee never wanted all his life long. But this rather confuteth then proveth these to bee the very *cause* or *causes* that † in the hower of his dreadfull *Passion* wrought in him such Agonies and consternation of minde. But these things heere I omit, beeing heereafter more fully discussed. Lastly you cast a needles rebuke vpon me for "confounding the *Causēs* of the Agonie and of the Complaint togeather. Forsooth that was done not without reason, I thinke: Every reasonable man, I beleeve, will say, that the same cause was of them both in Christ. His Agonie and his Complaint are not so contrary nor so divers, but that they might, yea verily did proceed from the same cause and ground. Yea *Ambrose*, one of your Authours doeth "plainly ioine the both togeather. Yea your selfe doth also, as by comparing † your *cause* of the Agonie, with your 1. or 2. of the *Complaint, will appeare. You have much cause then, have you not, to make such out: yes vpon me, that I am *strangely amazed, confounded, and forgetfull* in my writing? Good wordes I pray you. I did but ioine them togeather whom your selfe & others do make all one. But I have stood too long on these tryfls.

Now you will shew some *examples of my mistaking or perverting your owne reasons*. For these hitherto were not his, but the *Fathers* opinions, as before I noted. I marveyle then why he troubleth him selfe and vs with them, if they be not his; specially if he propound them not to be receaved? Why labourerth hee so to distract vs with such varieties? And then to tell vs they are not his, but other mens. Yet such mens he telleth vs they are, as that it must not be for our Credit to refuse them. Thus the poore people are strangely taught: thus the world shalbe filled full of ambigui-

ties, doubtfulness, variety of opinion in matters of Religion: and withall forbidden to rest vpon any certaine and particular reason, as also he dealeth in other cases. But I omit to prosecute this any further. For we shall now see some of his owne matters, which I have ignorantly or purposely perverted.

First [“] he telleth vs, that *In the Effectes of Christes Crosse he noted out of the Apostle to the Hebrues, three properties of the true propitiatorie Sacrifice which tooke away the sinne of the worlde. It was a Bodily, a Bloody, and a Deadly Sacrifice; for so you speake.* This is one of your reasons, yea almost the greatest, to proove the Question against vs: because *Christes Bodily Sufferings & bloodshed were the true propitiatio of our finnes.* But what a reason is this? How diffireth it fro our Assertion? That the true Sacrifice for sinne, must be indeed bodily, bloody, & dead we doubt not: we vnfeignedly & heartily doe embrace it. The Patriarkes beleevd it, the Jewes sacrifices of beastes figured it, the new Testament confirmeth it. But how will it follow then, Ergo Christes Bodily death onely & meere lie was the wholl ransom and price of sinne. For we must note that this is the very Question in deed; this is the point of our Controversy, as I have shewed, if you will deale plainly. If you speake not to this point, your words are Ambiguous and deceitfull: and that notable fault is in your selfe most true, which [“] you wrongully charge me with: *you dally with generall and doubtful termes, which according as they are expounded, may eyther make with you or against you.* And most rightly of your wholl booke being indeed a huge volume for so little matter, I may say that which you obiect: *most vnaptly against my smal pamphlet Three lines directly to the purpose had ben more worth the so many leues thus wastfully spent.* Wherefore, if you meane these wordes directly to the purpose in deed, and doe intend to conelude that which we plainly deny, and as now at this time we will vnderstand your meaning to bee, that the meere Bodily Sufferings of Christ, without any proper sufferings of his Soule, are the intier and whole ransom for sinne: then I affirme exprelly there is no piece of reason, nor likenes of any argument in these wordes. This will not follow by any meanes from your text. Againe, if the Sacrifice, as it is onely Bodily, Bloody, and Deadly, doth wholly purge sinne, then although Christs Bo

“ pag. 31

“ Pag. 3

“ Pag. 301

“ Pa. 24

† Heere
the He
Your me
is and m
in this
That Ch
meere b
& blood
sufferings
whole

dily death and bloudshed wanted not the sympathy of the Soule, yet it followeth that no action or passion of his Soule, neither this by sympathy nor any other, I say none at all as being in the Soule, was regarded as propitiatory and meritorious. Which if you once affirme plainly, then we will seeke no further for your drift, wee may know your meaning well enough. Christs Soule shall have no place, no merit, no respect at all in the matter of Propitiation. Howbeit elswhere I see in you manifest Contrariety heerevnto. For sundry times you teach that Christ did suffer peculiarly and severally some *proper punishments* (which I hope were propitiatory & meritorious) in his Soule, besides his Bodily suffering: Yea that this was a part of his Crosse & the effect of Gods wrath on his Soule as well as the suffering in his Body. Now how can this be true, if our wholl Ransom & propitiation be only Bodily, bloody, and deadly: which is the point that heere *you stand on. But you have reasons "you say to confirm your maine matter, among many these 1: *The Jewish Sacrifices, and the Sacramentes of Christians. The 1st, shadowing and foreshewing, the 2. testifying and confirming that the true sacrifice for sinne was Bodily and bloody. Still what trifling is this? Doth any in the World deny it, that the true Sacrifice for sin was the Body, blood, and death of the Redeemer? Wherefore the * Proposition must be as I " did set it in your behalfe: The Jewish Sacrifices were shadowes or Figures, and our * Sacramentes were signes of our wholl and absolute redemption by Christ. I say of the wholl and intire propitiatory Sacrifice, or els you shrinke and leave the Question. As for your paines of Hell in such sense as "you vnderstand them, that is including the locall punishment among the Damned, Desperation, finall reiection, and such like, so there was never any that thought Christe Suffered Hell paines, as 'before is declared. Where you say, that I expound these *Figures of our wholl and absolute redemption* to bee of all the *fruits and causes of our redemption*, why do you vntuly charge me with that which I have not. I have no such word nor meaning as *fruits*. Indeed I named the Figures of * *Effects in Christ*, I meane Acts don by Christ: but I never thought them any where *fruits of our redemption*, but either causes or means or other necessary adioints. This therefore which indeed is the true Proposition, & being set as it ought to be I grant not, as you also vntuly charge me, I do still deny it in such maner,*

as I did before: "Generally All the Jewes Sacrifices did not Figure and shadow our wholl redemption in Christ. The inward and invisible things they all did not signifie. And yet I grant indeed, that they signified *what they were apt to teach and signifie*: namely the outward and Bodily sufferings only. This I say, many of the Jewes Sacrifices did represent and signifie, yea most of them, but not All. Therefore the "Assumption also I may well deny, as" I did before: affirming that certaine Jewish Sacrifices set forth the sufferings even of the Soule of Christ, and not of his Body onely. As 1. *that* "A Sacrifice consisting of 2. Goats, a slaine & a Scapegoat." You object heere against: 1. that I abuse the Text. That were a great fault: but let vs view the text. Thus are the very expresse wordes which you also recite: "Aaron shall take of the people 2. Goats for a Sinne-offering. Surely you must bring very good reason to frustrate so plaine a speech: That is, you say, to make a Sinne-offering of one of them. Nay, the very wordes are, take 2. Goats for a Sinne-offering: it saith not, take 2. Goats that one of them may be a Sinne-offering. But this sheweth so much, you thinke, where the text saith, *Lotteries were cast over the 2. Goates one lot for the Lord, the other for the Scapegoat. And Aaron shall offer the Goat on which the Lordes lot shall fall, and make him a Sinne-offering.* These wordes prove not that the Scapegoat was no Sinne-offering at all: Vnlesse this were true, that no Sinne-offering can possibly bee but by killing and slaying and sheadding of blood. Although the "Scripture say, *Without shedding of blood is no remission*, yet it meaneth that *Almost all things are in the Law purged with blood.* That is, many Offerings and sacrifices are bloody, but not all. I take now sacrifice and offering in the largest sense, as signifying any consecrated thing given to God to appease him for sinne. And such unbloody Sinne-offerings very many we shall finde in "Moses Law. Wherefore the Scapegoat may be yet a Sinne-offering, though it were not slaine nor bloody. And his utter sending away into the unknown Deserts, may answer to the consuming of som other Sacrifices by fire. Thus then these wordes of the text which you bring doe not proue the Scapegoat to be no Sinne-offering at all: they proue it to be no bloody Offering, and therefore not such, but of another kind then the slaine Goat was. It might be consecrated and offered to the Lord, and utterly sequestred from men, and beare and

" Pag. 10.
" I mean
the propo
of their o
ward app
raret, they
not expre
the whole.

" Pag. 114
" Treat. 1.
pag. 120

" Lev. 16.
" Pag. 134

" ver. 52

" Heb. 9

" Lev. 2.
11, 13

13.
Nomb. 1.
& 18, 19
& 28, 29

14.

take away sinne no lesse then the slaine Goat: wherein verily consisteth the nature and being of a Sacrifice or true Sinne-offering. And in very deepe all this the text following expressly avoucheth of the Scapegoat. *"The Scapegoat shall be presented alive before the Lord to make reconciliation by him, & to let him go for a Scapegoat.* Heere is his Consecrating unto the Lord, yea reconciliation also is made by him, though he dyed not as the other did. Againe more plainly, *"And Aaron shall put both his handes vpon the head of the live Goat and confesse vpon him all the iniquities of the Children of Israel & all their trespasses and all their sinnes putting them vpon the head of the Goat, and shall send him away (alive) into the Wildernes. So the Goat shall beare vpon him all their iniquities into the Wildernes, being let go thither.* Can there be any thing in the world more full and strong to prove that the Scapegoat also was a true Sinne-offering, or rather a true parte of this whole and intire Sinne-offering consisting and being compleat in both these Goats the slaine and the Scapegoat together. For as the slaine Goate so this Scapegoat, wee see, was aswell *"Consecrated to the Lord, and heere Offered (though not by killing) and separated from men, & bare vpon him all the sinnes of the people and carryed them cleane away.* So wee may reade of other Sacrifices consisting and being compleat wholly *"of Sacrifices of sundry diuers kindes. The bloody Sacrifice had conioyned together with it, the vnblondy Sacrifice of the Meat offering, and another of the Drinke offering &c. Which may very likely represent vnto vs the sundry and diuers kindes of Christes meritorious Sufferings in his life time & at his Death, som bloody, some vnblondy: but all concurring together & making the full and perfite propitiation for al our sinnes. And even such a Sacrifice or Sinne-offering it seemeth surely these 2. Goats were. Heere then your aduisednes may bee noted by all men, which doe reprove me for this assertion, and that with such violent and vncomly termes. Now if it be a Figurative Sinne-offering, what signified this Figure? Certainly it signified Christ, and his taking away of our sinnes by his death. Have you any colour of reason to maintaine those wide coniectures of the Ancients, that the Scapegoat signified the Reprobate and cast away people: or else cursed Barrabas that scaped death when Iesus was slaine. Who but you would defend these palpable mistakinges of those men? And*

ver. 10.

ver. 21, 22.

ver. 10.

ver. 21, 22.

Nomb. 28.

Leu. 16.

Yrill, Am.

Beda.

why? Because they are Ancient. Yet see you not the expresse text against the? Do damned men, or did Barrabas *reconcile vs to God, & take away our sinnes*, as the Scapegoat did typically? Nay surely: It must needs be then, that it signified *Christ*, yea doubtles *Christ man*. For the *Godhead* could bee no *Sinne-offering* neither did it *make reconciliation for sinne*, neither did the *Deity* *bear our sinnes* upon himselfe properly: all which the *Scapegoat* did. Further, if it were *Christ man*, it could not be his *Body*: for his body was *slaine bloudily*, the Scapegoat was not *slaine*. For the other Goat (a Sacrifice to) being *slaine*, *this survived and went away into the land of separation*. It must then be of necessity (I thinke) the *Humane mortall Soule of Christ* which the Scapegoate signified: which was a true *Sinne-offering* and made propitiation for vs, as well as the *slaine Goat*, and *bare upon him our sinnes*: though his Soule dyed not *bloudily* nor by *loosing life and sense*, as his body and the typical *slaine Goat* did. You say, "If this Scapegoat do signifie *Christs Soule*, then it cannot be that *Christs Soule* Suffered, much lesse dyed any death. This objection truly you might haue spared: seeing my selfe before brought it & fully answered it: whereagainst you have said never a word. The effect whereof is this: The escaping of the Goat may lively shew vnto vs that *Christs Soule* dyed not as the *Body* dyed by *loosing life and sense*, but surviving went hence into *Hades*, the land of separation, the invisible world of the Dead. But in that the Scapegoat did *bear* and *sustaine our sinnes*, and was indeede a *Sinne-offering* to as well as the *slaine Goat*, so it may well signifie that *Christs Soule* properly suffered and sustayned the burden of our sinnes in satisfying for them, no lesse then his body which was *bloudily slaine* therefore. As for the *Dying of Christs Soule* we shall answer you for that in due place hereafter. So that, Now where you say, "I am more bold then wise in affirming the Scapegoat to signifie the Soule of Christ. Surely then I were like you, who affirme as *boldly*, that among the Iewes no Sacrifice at all foreshewed any Suffering of the Soule of Christ: which you can never prove. Howbeit this I acknowledge indeed that the Iewish Figures, though they be applyable vnto Christ the substance of those shaddowes, yet wee ought to apply them in the particulars soberly and warily, and not without some plaine proportion of the Figure with the thing Figured. Wherefore my meaning

* Typically.

* Pag. 232

* Treat. 1.1

* Pag. 250

ning is none other in these Iewish figures, which the Scripture doth not any where expressly interpret, but to shew what I thinke to be indeed most probable and likely, knowing that yet som such matter, as we aime at, they do signifie without question. And this is sufficient to deny your Assertion, which against our saying that *the sufferings of Christes Soule may be signified by the Scapegoat*, is but meerely coniecturall and presumed.

Page. 236.

Lev. 1. & 6.

Lev. 4. 11.

Lev. 16. 27.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Lev. 13. 11.

Even that
meerely in
the Soule
viz. when it
grew vche-
ment

The very like are your 3. reasons brought to shew that the "*Holocaust*" cannot signifie the sufferings of whole Christe, and therefore not of his Soule any way. Your former reason is, because the *Holocaust* was 1. *slaine and after burnt*: for then if the *burning* signifieth Christes *paines and sufferings*, Christ must seeme to suffer after his death. But this is a weake inference. Is there any Figure or similitude concurring in all points and circumstances with the thing signified? Sure there is no man of knowledge so vnexpert or so vnreasonable as to require it. Many times where they agree only but in one principall respect, that sufficeth to make the similitude. Againe many similitudes and Figures there are in the olde Law having as great disparagemēt to the things signified by them as this in the *Holocaust* which you talke of. The Bodies of beasts first "*slaine*", were *after* carryed out of the Host. Now these signified Christes *going out of Jerusalem* to be *slaine*, but being yet alive. Againe the beasts carryed out *by others* after they were *slaine*. "*if*" likened to our *voluntary and free* leaving of the world in this life. Lastly the "*burning*" of the beastes after they were dead, was a sacrifice of a sweet savour vnto God. Which in truth is Christes *very death*, and nothing don by him afterward, whereby Gods anger is fully pacified towards vs. Wherefore your first exception is very vaine. The 2. is like to it. The *Holocaust* was consumed in one & the same fire. But Christ was tormented wholly not with one kind of suffering (as we maintaine) but with 2. kindes, that is with bodily & spiritmall sorrowes. First I say, this also, if it were true, is as weak an exception as the former, and altogether like it. See: Though Christ indeed suffered divers and sundry kindes of sorrowes yet even of those which were meerely outward and bodily, as also of those that were meerely Spirituall and inward, yet we plainly affirme that one & "*the same*" torment afflicted his whole manhood by sympathy. For his Soule also was sore grieved I doubt not with

with his proper Bodily torments: likewise his Body, when his *trickling sweat was clats of blood*, was crushed and broken vnspeakeably with his inward and spirituall sorrowes, though his flesh then felt outwardly no paine. So your 2. exception is also nothing. The 3. is no better: where you argue from ^a my words, that the *Bodies of beastes could not prefigure the immortall & reasonable Soule of Christ*. And it is like to that which ^b afterward you cite from my words about the Sacraments, *Earthly Elements cannot set out spirituall and invisable effectes in Christ*. Hence you thinke that I cannot defend that the *fiery consuming of the Holocaust* may signifie the sorrows both of the Soule and Body of Christ. You shall see that I can full easily, and without any trifling. It is evident that I meane in those former places, that bodily thinges generally and for the most part doe represent the meere bodily & externall parts of Christes sufferings: but not alwayes and altogether. Which you might haue easily seene by my answer to the *Assumption* and by the instances which there I give to this purpose. Again the very instances which I give, viz: the *Scapegoat*, the *Holocaust*, & afterward the *bread broken* in the communion, these I say doe not in that respect as they are Bodily things represent the Soule of Christ or any matter pertayning to it. But the peculiar vsage and maner of action about them doth lively represent the suffering of his soule and not of his body only. As, not the *Goat* representeth Christes soule, vnles only in respect of the *escaping* of it whe the other *Goat* dyed, & also in respect of the *sustaining and bearing* vpon himself of our sinnes. And not the *body of the Holocaust*, but the *utter consuming by fire of the whole*, signifieth the sufferings of whole Christ. Lastly the *bread* may signifie the whole Christ who is the intire and perfit bread of life: but the *Breaking thereof into pieces* representeth more lively the breaking & crushing in pieces (as it were) of the soul rather the of the body. Which was *pierced* through, but was not in case of being *broken in pieces*, so likely as the Soul was. Yet (you will say) the *Hol.* may signifie that whole Christe suffered but some bodily afflictions, the Soul feeling the griefs & paines of the Body. For how wil it follow that the *proper and immediat* sufferings of Christes Soule might be signified by the *Holocaust*? Surely according to the proportion of the *Holocaust* to whole Christ, & then his very Soule chiefly, was

a Treat.
pag. 12.

b pag. 12.

c Treat.
pag. 12.

as it were *chopt or broken into pieces*, and as it were *quite consumed and swallowed up in his fiery sorrowes*: onely the assistance of his Godhead sustained his Soule and withall his body, or els he could not have borne it, as ^a I noted M. *Whitakers* to have truly taught. This can not bee but the Soules *peculiar* suffering of Gods very wrath, far beyond *all bodily* sufferings: and yet not those paines of *Hell*, as ^b you grossly vtter it. Your other senses that you give heere of, the 1. hindreth not mine, that is ^c the *Acceptation of Christes death*. The 2. that is *Christes fleshes incorruption after death* is very hard and far fetcht. And *Sacrifices* had their respect to Christes death, not to any thing further or afterwards. As for another sense out of *Austin* that it should signifie *our perfection and burning charity*, it cannot be true: for the *Holocaust-sacrifice* out of question primarily signified the person of Christ, not ours. Sec: it is vntrue that any man besides Christ alone is or can bee *perfect* in this life, that he should bee *wholly* consumed with Heavenly love, according to the proportion of the consuming of the *Holocaust*. Also you both heere do seeme double, vnderstanding by the *Holocaust* both *incorruption after death*, & a *perfect burning Love in vs now in this life*. Which things are farre distant asunder and cannot stand together. But all these are so vnlikely, that I will leave them to the consideration of the godly wise.

Then ^d you come to your next reason about the *Sacramentes*, wherein you thinke to touch me. First you reprove mee for saying, ^e *Sacraments are Earthly elementes, they cannot set out the spirituall and invisible effects in Christ*. This say you is against the definition of a *Sacrament*, which is, *A visible signe of invisible grace*. I answer, first you rather oyerthrow your self in vrging this against me: for your owne main assertion is that neither the Iewish *Sacrifices* nor Christian *Sacraments* do signifie any more then the *bodily and bloody death* of Christ. Then it is your selfe Sir indeede that denyeth the very definition of *Sacraments*, that they are visible signes of invisible graces. For I hope the *Bodily and bloody death* of Christ, and the renting of his flesh with whips, nayles, and speares were *visible* and not invisible things. As for me I can easily defend my self although you sayle in this. For I holde that *Sacraments* are indeede visible signes of invisible graces wrought in vs by Christ: and yet vsually they represent not spirituall and invisible

Effects or Acts in Christ himselfe, but only the externall and visible partes of his Passion. Can you not reconcile these two? Any beginner in Christianitie will easily do it. Next^b you make me to crosse the Institution of the Lords Table, because^c I said the Ceremony of *breaking the bread* cannot properly belong to Christes body. But even heere doe not I say expressely, that it *sheweth forth how Christes body was broken for us*? Which you say is the Institution, and this I plainly acknowledge: where then is mine error, and what is it? Indeed I meane that *the breaking of the bread into many pieces* doth not set out primarily the breaking of his body, but of his soule first and immediatly, and then of his Body ioinly and consequentlie. Againe, that it doth not set out properly *the pearcing or boring through* of Christes body with the spear or nayles nor his lashing with the whip: because^d *Klōmenan is broken to pieces* properly, and^e *Meducca* in the Prophet is also *Broken to pieces* properlie, or *crushed and broken to powder*. As these^f Scripture do vse this word likewise, and also all Lexicons do confirme. Yours^g allegatiōs therefore about the vse of *Dacha* otherwise, shew not the *proper*, but the *vse thereof altered*. Thus then still I say our former places are not to be meant principallie of Christes Body, for it was not *properly broken*: which also my other place sheweth sufficientlie where it is said, ^h*Not a bone of him was broken*. Seeing it is manifest that none of his flesh was separated from his bones. But of necessitie it must have ben so, if his *flesh* had ben properlie broken into pieces, and yet his bones not broken. ⁱYou say, From a part the whole may and doth properly take denomination. First you must shew that some parte of him was *properly broken into pieces*: which hitherto is proved to the contrary. That fable which^k you bring of the *Nayles* being so great that Constantine of them made him a Bridle and a Helmet, will not helpe to prove that his Body was *properly broken*. Neither is *cutting* or *tearing*, or *pearcing through* which onely indeed the Scripture warranteth, that *Breaking properly* which^l that word in the Prophet before noted doth *properly* signifie. And I pray is that true, that from a part the whole may and doth *properly* take denomination. Doth it *properly*? From a part to the whole is a Figure of speech. Is a *Figurative* speech a *proper* speech wth you? Vainly you charge me I know not how often against my expresse words, that I call *Hell Heaven*, and *Descending Ascending*. But heere it is no wrong to charge you

a Albeit
consequen
& implic
I deny
but all
Passion
be vnder
stood as
b Pag. 239
c Treat. 1.
pag. 14.

d 1 Cor. 11.
e Isa. 53.
f Nom. 11.
Isa. 19. 10.
Dent. 23.
Likewise
ther word
very same
nure. 3 Ch
34. 7. 3 K
23. 6. 15.
16. 12. 15.
21. and 22.
and 41. 25.
Mic. 4. 1.
g Psal. 14.
Jer. 44.
Except 10.
a. wher
portio
kept of
per fens
breake
pieces
words
Psal. 14.
51. 17.
h 1oh. 19.
i Pag. 239

k Pag. 4.

l Dada.

with such an absurdity indeed, who expressly do make that which you say is *Figurative* to bee a *proper denomination*. I am sure your Grammar was better, before you were as you are. But to proceede if you aske mee, whether doe I thinke that ^a those places, of the Apostle and the Prophet doe signifie at all the pearcing of his body. I aunswere they may by a generall and *vnproper* speech, as piercing may be an vnproper kind of breaking. For seeing the H. Ghost by those wordes intendeth to shew the whole outward violence and destruction of his flesh also, and not onely the breaking & bruizing of his Soule, therefore I deny not but heerein so much may be signified, yet in no wise not that alone, nor by a *proper* signification, as I have said. Nowe where you catch at an advantage in me as you thinke, in that I said, ^b The Cæremony of breaking the bread (or that breaking to pieces in Isay) cannot belong properly to Christes body, *but to his soule*. I grant taking my wordes at the worst, and thinking me to be a senseles foole (as indeed you do in your whole writing) so you may construe them as if I had said, *The Soule might be properly broken to pieces*. But other men (not inferior to your L. in learning, none disprayed) who have read this Treatise, have cõceaved me thus. *This breaking to pieces cannot be properly said of Christs body, not in any sense proportionable to the property of the c words. But his Soule may rather & more truly be said to have ben broken and bruized to pieces in such wise as soules may be broken with sorrows & extraordinary anguish, and so was his Body likewise by sympathy with his Soule*. Where I deny not but *Broken* applyed to the Soule is *Figurative*: yet keeping a iust and full proportion with the *proper* sense of *Breaking to pieces*, which we cannot keepe referring it to his Body. So that thus it is neerer and better applyed to the Soule then to the Body of Christ, which was only pierced or bored through.

Then you rehearse another of your reasons tending to the very same effect as that last before. You will prove (^d you say) that the blood of our Saviour is the *true price* of our redemption, and that aswel of our Soules as of our Bodies. Still you deale fraudulently for who denyeth this as your wordes runne. But wee know you meane, ^e that no more but the shedding of his blood onely and meere is the *iust and full* satisfaction of all our sinnes even in the righteous and sincere iudgment of God. Then we absolutely

your Assertion, as before we haue don the like. As for your ^a allea-
 ged Scriptures we answer them as we did generally ^b before: that
 they meane not the *meer* blood of Christ nor *only* the body sing-
 ly and simply considered but, that together with the proper suf-
 ferings of his *Soule* also they were the *last and full* satisfaction, and
 redemption. Against which you have nothing any where. And
 likewise our advised and resolute answer is to ^c all the rest of your
 scriptures which most tediously and vainly you heape vp & scat-
 ter every where in your former treatise to this effect, as if they con-
 tained somwhat for your purpose, when as indeed there is no such
 text any where that bath any meaning of your stränge conceit. So
 that wee shall have no need to trouble our selves any more here-
 after about any of them. Yet ^d heere you vrge a reason against vs:
If our Soules be not redeemed by the blood of Christ our bodies knowe
no benefit of redemption (you meane) from death. But we have re-
deemed; not we should. Ergo it is our Soules which are redeemed; our
bodies are not redeemed as yet in this life. Wherein we haue to note
 3. things. 1. Your Proposition is vaine and illogically having no
 consequence in it at all. Which maketh mee to thinke that I hit
 your meaning right and mistooke you not in my former booke.
 Howbeit to try this your sentence heere, what if our *Soules* were
 not at all redeemed by Christes blood but some other way, or not
 by his blood *meerly and onely* (which indeede is our question)
 will it follow that therefore our *bodies* are still mortall, and there-
 fore not redeemed from death? Or what if our *Soules* be redeemed
 by his blood, as indeed they are, though not wholly nor only there-
 by. What followeth then from this? Nay what if our *Soules* and
Bodies were redeemed *wholly and onely* by Christes blood, is there
 any consequence that therefore our *bodies* should *not* be redeemed
 from death, and never dy. Truly I cannot discerne, but that your
 proposition meaneth some such consequence as this; which is to
 me a very stränge reason. Yet that which you ad ^e afterward is more
 stränge: *If our Soules be not redeemed (wholly) by the (meer) blood*
of Christ. (For thus still I say you must make your wordes; or els
you aske the very Question) then our bodies haue verely no good,
even so good as all by the death of Christ. In which sentence verily
 I can see neither head nor taile. Chose you now, whether you will
 that you speake this *sophistically*, or *absurdly*. For I cannot dis-
 cern.

a 1 Pet. 1.
 Rev. 3. 6.
 b Treat. 1.
 pag. 8. 9.

c pag. 58.
 do. 61. 7.
 d.

d pag. 24.

e 1. Pet. 1.
 Rev. 3. 6.

f Pag. 1.

g. 32.

cerne it: I leave it therefore to your self to determine. But perhaps
 you will yet againe go backe to that you excused your selfe with-
 all before. You will meane that our bodies in this life have *no be-
 nefit of redemption from death, even no more then the bodies of In-
 fidels*. And this plainly you avouch for truth. Is this true, Are not
 our bodies now already freed from the curse & the sting of death,
 from all the hurt & harme that properly and naturally is in death?
 Is it not made vnto vs a quiet sleepe and a peaceable rest, an en-
 trance for our Soules into Heaven, a putting off of sin to our bo-
 dies, in such wise that Christ taketh from it the ^a name of Death
 and calleth it but ^b a passage? Or have the *Infidels* also thus much
 benefit in death, as wee have in it by our redemption in Christ? I
 know not therefore how to terme this your assertion, I forbear to
 name it as it deserveth: it is more then strange that Infidels bodies
 should have *as much benefit of redemption from death*, as our bo-
 dies have by Christ. Dy I grant, or cease to breath we must and do
 still even as they do. And this death by the *naturall* property of it
 is a part of Gods Curse: but to the faithfull there are great benefits
 idoynd even *in death* by the gracious dealing of God peculiarly to-
 wardos his children, which also their bodies are partakers of tho-
 rough the death of Christ. The naturall sting is taken out of it for
 the godly, yet it remayneth to the *Infidells* and hurteth them by
 (retayning even their bodies (though dead) in & vnder Gods dread-
 full Curse. Wherefore it makes many to thinke that indeed you
 uttered this matter somewhat otherwise in your Sermons, then
 heere you doe now publish it: and it perswadeth mee still that I
 mistooke you not, seeing this your turning & setting of it is so vn-
 habson. For every one may see by this your handling of it, that
 then you said more then heere you expresse: and heere you would
 faine fashion it to som what, but you cannot. Yea your own words
 bewray som alteration fro that which so confidently you preach-
 ed, where you say, *Whatsoever the wordes were that you might use,
 which you do not acknowledge to be these that I bring*. Lastly, you
 grant that you used this reason in handling the power of Christ *in
 death*: that is, when you preached it. For now in this Treatise you
 have cleane left it out, for ought that I can see, which bewrayeth
 that it was such, as your selfe saw was not to be maintayned, how-
 soever heere you strive to set some colour vpon it, though yet
 in vaine.

Before we depart from this point, That not the blood of Christ nor his flesh *meerely and only* without respect to the merit of his whole Soule was the full price of Redemption, heere is fit place to shew how sundry of the Ancient Fathers do agree with vs sufficiently in this matter: although afterward in your booke you seeme to bring them against vs. But indeed so they seeme onely: for in truth they are with vs as by these following we may see. First ^a Irenaeus, *The Lord bought vs with his owne blood, and gave his soule for our soules, & his flesh for our flesh.* ^b Cyrill, *He bestowed his flesh as a ransom for our flesh, and made his Soule likewise a price of redemption for our Soules, although he lived againe, being by nature life it selfe.* ^c Nazianzen maketh every part of man to be sanctified by the like in Christ, our condemned flesh by his flesh, our soule by his soule, our understanding by his understanding. ^d Ambrose saith *Merorem anima nostra sua anima merore abolevit: He abolished the sorrow of our Soule by the sorrow of his Soule.* And ^e *Hoc in se obtulit Christus quod induit &c.* Christ offered in sacrifice all about which he assumed: that is all & every whit that was in him besides his Godhead. ^f Fulgentius, He shewed in himselfe the sufferinges of a whole man in verity & truth, *quicquid fuit infirmitatis anima suae peccato suscepit & pertulit: Hee took upon him and suffered whatsoever infirmity may be in the soule without sinne.* It is not possible that wee our selues should speake a more effectuell sentence for our purpose then this is. Say as Fulgentius heere saith, and we aske no more. All that & you except, that by these Fathers Christ dyed only the death of the flesh, is lesse then heere they affirme. And we shall answer to that in due place. Now marke well, how these Fathers do not say that Christ gave his life for a ransom onely, (as you would construe it) but even his very Soule so for our Soules. They strive to expresse an exact proportion so far as was possible betwene Christ and vs. First in the parts of Christ who suffered, & of vs who were saved. So that as we are saved not in our bodies onely, nor only in the externall sensitiue parte of our soules (wherein standeth that suffering with and by our bodies) but wee are saved redeemed and sanctified in our whole Spirit and Understanding also: even so (by their verdict) Christ suffered for vs not the bodily and outward sufferinges by Sympathy onely, but hee suffered for vs even in his *Minde* also. Now this is directly against

a Iren. 5. 1.

b Cyr. de re
sal. ad Thec Naz. in tr
ad Chd Ambro. V
Luc. 22. T
trist. dolor
&c.e De incarn
Sacr. esp.f Fulgent.
Thrasym
lib. 1.

g Pag. 26.

h Pag. 70.

Pa. 236. 240
Hecrep. 14

by nature we
are subiect to
suffer in the
minde pro-
perly for sin:
and not only
by Sympathy
from the Body
Cyrill. Thei-
ur. 10. 3.
Barnard. de
ass. Dom.
ap. 41.

Pag. 7.
Tertul. cont.
Max.
Amb. in Luc.
De trist.
olor. &c.
Jerom. in
sa. 55.

All kindes:
both in
spirit & Body.
all parti-
ans in the.

Pag. 10. 12.

Pag. 87.

Cyp. de
passi.

In the place
above cited.

your present ^a Affliction which we have in hand. Also heere they observe an exact proportion in the Objects so far as was possible, viz: in that which he suffered for vs, & that which we are saved from thereby. Thus that sorrow of the immortall parte of the Soule & not of body only, which we are saved from, the same he suffered. Yea I say all and every whit of those passions & sorrowes whereunto mans nature is ^b subiect and capable of, and from which we are saved, all the same he tasted and suffered for vs. Thus it is also that Cyrill elsewhere saith, ^c *Omnia perpeffus est ut nos ab omnibus liberaret: He suffered all things throughly, that hee might acquit vs from all, which els we should have suffered.* And thus I take Barnards meaning to be, ^d *He spared not him selfe who knoweth how to spare his.* Wherevpon you collect well, if you meane so ^e *He suffered and indured All to the uttermost with exact obedience and patience.* To which end Tertullian also, ^f *Sic reliquit, dum non parcit. This was Gods forsaking of him in his passion, that in nothing he spared him.* And thus Ambrose & Minus consulerat *mibi nisi meum suscepisset affectum, He had don lesse for me, if he had not ben (altogether) affected as I should have ben.* And thus Jerom, ^h *Quod nos pro nostris debebamus sceleribus sustinere, ille pro nobis passus est, pacificans &c.* That wich we should have borne for our sinnes, the same hee suffered for vs. Wherefore by the Fathers Christ suffered exactly ⁱ All & whatsoever sorrowes & paines which we should have suffered, as well Spirituall as Corporall as well in all the powers of the Soule subiect to suffering, as in that which suffered allwayes with and from the body. Only they except 2. pointes which of simple necessity indeed must be excepted in the Sonne of God, which before ^k I have also acknowledged: 1. Sinne, and all sinfull concomitantes and consequentes as ^l you speake. And that is it which Cyprian exactly noteth, That in him there was ^m *Similitudo pene non Culpa*, the very like punishment as should have ben in vs: only there was no sinne nor fault in him as is in vs. The 2. point excepted is, that he suffered not eternally, but for a while: for he that was life it selfe could not but live againe, saith ⁿ Cyrill. Where he seemeth to acknowledge a kind of death even of the soule, from which Christ revived againe. But of that in due place heereafter. Nowe heere it is manifest that even the Fathers, of whom you doe so exceedingly boast, are

against you and for vs in the 1. and chiefest point of this questions shewing that Christ suffered not *only bodily, or in the soules by Symphary only*, but in the Minde also distinctly, even as we may suffer in minde distinctly fro our bodily suffering, that is when we suffer somewhat *immediatly from God*. Yea he suffered (say these Fathers) all the paines which els we should haue suffered: no materiall thing excepted but *only sinne*, otherwise he was spared by *dispensation* in nothing. Against this cleere and plaine sence of the Fathers you take no exception, neither can you.

Thus having hitherto manestly defended my selfe, that I haue not abused any way the Fathers nor yet your selfe, as you vniustly charge me in *c* your entrance: Now I am to doe the like against *c* your vn sufficient refusing of my Reasons. Where by, I hope, it shall appeare that you have not weakened any one of them. And First you begin with rehearsing my wordes, wherein I briefly noted the very Question betweene vs, *That Christ suffered for vs the Wrath of God*. Which you *e* exclaime at without measure, as being not the point which you preached against. Howbeit I suppose these wordes do rightly and fitly set out the matter, both which then you preached, & which now you write. I haue *e* here before truly & fully declared the whole state of this controversy, I trust. Yet because we can never open this point to much for many good vses that it hath, I will not thinke it tedious nor labour lost ne to rip vp this question a litle againe in this place, that so we may proceede with more ease.

Your generall cariage in your booke declareth, that you abuse the Reader exceedingly by the ambiguous and equivocall taking of this terme *Gods Wrath*, as before in the entrance I have shewed. It is not I that abuse them, as you *a* every where very bitterly and vnreasonably do charge me. For according to the most vsuall and common sence of *Gods Wrath*, so in my wholl Treatise I take it for *Gods perfect Holynes, Iustice, & Power* properly executing vengeance & punishment (whether little or great) due to them on whom *sinne* lyeth. But you generally do so cary this phrase, as signifying any punishment of sinne whatsoever: and namely the Afflictions which the very Godly do suffer, which is altogether an *vnproper* speech. This I observe most specially in one place of your booke above others. Where you say, *All kinds of troubles, paines, and griefs in our states, bodies, and minde, which shorten or sower this*

present life are degrees of Gods wrath, and chasticements of our transgression & corruption. Which presently you prove by many needeles Scriptures. And from this sense of his Fathers wrath you do not exempt the Lord Christ. You meane that this he suffered indeed, and that this is all in your opinion. It is true *All troubles paines & griefes* in their first Ordinance ^a were the effects of Gods proper wrath. But in their state and condition now, they are ^b not, namely, as the Godly do suffer them. Which we must ~~must~~ heere note and consider well. You say right also: This, *because it seemeth grievous for the present and not ioyous is called* (somtymes) *in the Scriptures the rodde and wrath of God.* True; it seemeth. But indeed it is not so, or it ought not so to be. For ^c it seemeth otherwise to the iudgment of faith and knowledg. Then Gods wrath in this sense is very improperly taken: as I have often said. Wherefore speaking properly & exactly as in this Cōtroversy we ought according to the revealed minde of the Holy Ghost, it is *Chastisement & correction*: it is not in any wise *Wrath*, or punishment properly meant. Neyther may it be said properly that his *Iustice* leadeth him to inflict it on vs (as ^a you affirme) but it is his *Holynes* and Love towards his children which chasteneth them. According to the Scripture which saith, ^e *God chasteneth us for our profit, that we might be partakers of his Holynes.* And ^f *whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth: he scourgeth every sonne that he receaveth.* If we indure chastening, God offereth himselfe unto us as unto sonnes: for what sonne is it whom the Father chasteneth not. Therefore to speake properly not Gods Iustice, but his Holynes and Fatherly Love doth move him to lay whatsoever Crosses and troubles vpon his children. He is not unto them a Iudge or Revenger, but a Father: Neyther is it *Wrath* that cometh from him or *Vengeance* for sinne properly, but ^h amendment in Love towards the godly. Now the case with Christ was cleane other wise. He needed no Amendment, but that which he suffered was right Punishment. He was neyther in case as the wicked, nor yet simply as the godly. He differed from them both, and yet in som pointes did partake of both their conditions. He was like the godly, in that he was highly beloved of God, and had no maner of sinne of his own laid to his charge. He was like the wicked and differed from the case of the godly greatly, because he was laden & charged with sinnes: yea with all maner of sinnes, & sustayned their due punishment.

TREATISE OF CHRIST'S SUFFERINGS.

there being also none other at all to indure the vengeance of God for them but himselfe. As we haue largely shewed before in opening the state of our Question. Thus then whatsoever Christ suffered (and specially at his death) was very wrath and vengeance from God properly taken, true punishment and iustice executed against sinne & for sinne, to the which he was in som sort condemned and appointed, also this was the true Curse of the Law which thus he sustayned for vs. Nevertheless in all this his Case was extraordinary, his condition in the like punishments vterly vnlike to the wicked. For his owne nature was still for all this most holy, faithfull, stedfast, loving the Lord, and beloved of him, albeit in his office of Redeeming vs and suretyship for vs he did sustaine truly, and not vnproperly, (as the Godly do) the Lordes very wrath against sinne which he tooke vpon him. Heere is now the Power of God to be deeply considered, together with his vnspokeable Justice, and Love and Holines. Even one of the greatest mysteries of Christian Religion: which to vnfolde what toying is able, yea what heart can conceave it? And yet most necessary & most comfortable to be vnderstood of all men. Namely how the Lord hath assigned to his sonne in the worke of Redemption 2. *personnes* as it were, or *countenances*, or *conditions*. His owne naturally, which God ever decreely loved: & our countenance, or person, or condition which he sustayned by his office, which condition the Lord truly accursed and punished. Only the sense of the paine of Gods Vengeance came indeede vnto his most holy nature: the Curse the Hatred, the wrath, and iudgment of God being quenched there with. His owne nature felt the sorrow and paine of the Curse and Hatred. But the Hatred & Curse was bent against the load of our sinne wherein he stood forth as guilty before God, and appeared as it were clothed therewith. This was Love and mercy to vs, this was Iustice vpon Christ having vnderaken for vs, this was infinite power and wisdom both wayes in God to bring it to passe, which no creature can comprehend: his Holynes and Love still chastening his Redeemed ones, but laying no part of true Punishment or proper Vengeance for sinne vpon them, which Christ only did for them wholly sustayne. Thus also seeing Christ indeed had no sinne in him (as the godly haue) who was not infected: neither could be corrupted & chastised for nothing, therefore properly he was not chastised

pag. 245.

As you de-
scribe it pag.
10. 49. 50.

pag. 15. 16.

The 5. 23

I observe
18.

Which you
do blame
244. 247.

chastised nor corrected at all, but his Afflictions every one both small and great were true and proper punishments, and the effects of Gods very wrath for our sinne lying vpon him. Somewhere^a you say, *Christ might suffer the wrath of God in his body, yea in his soule he might suffer it, and yet not the paines of the Damned, or of Hell.* We grant you say true, Christ suffered not the paines of the damned nor of Hell vnderstanding this for the very same condition & state altogether^b as the Damned are in. We abhorre such blasphemy as much as you that Christ so suffered Hell paines. Yea albeit I know you are far from thinking so, yet I say your words do com neerer vnto it then ours do, as is^c before noted. But I aske, do you graunt that Christ suffered Gods wrath in Spirit, as the Apostle^d somewhere distinguisheth the Spirit & Soule? If you meane not thus, then you againe vse sophistry deceaving vs with the worde *Soule*. For wee meane thereby in this Question onely the Spirit or Minde, as it is also called in exact and distinct speech. Howbeit speaking vulgarly and ordinarily we calle it the Soule: Which yet sometime is vnderstood onely for the Sensitive parts quickning the body and depending thereon. But this indeede is not it which we haue heere in question. If you meane *in Soules*, to be *properly and immediatly* in his immortall Spirit, as the ordinary phrase intendeth: and that so he suffered directly punishment for sin in his Soule, & not *Devotion & Pietys zealous Care* only (as I doubt^e you meane) then you differ not fro vs, but we al agree. And thus my wordes shalbe true, Christ suffered a sence of Gods wrath *equall to Hell it selfe, and all the torments thereof*. For as touching *Gods wrath* punishing his *Spirite*, who can say but that this was as hoar and skorching as Hell fire it selfe? Who can limit or measure the fury of Gods severe Iustice when he cometh in iudgment against sinne, as now he did vnto Christ? This therefore being well pondered, we may preceave that Christs sorrow & anguish which he indured for sinne, might very well be and was no doubt infinite yea even in those bodily stripes, woundes, and bloudshed, whose paines otherwise were finite. His soule not only discerning sensitively the bodily paine & smart, but chiefly in the vnderstanding he conceived, and in his faculty of *immediat* suffering he felt the fury of that hand which principally strooke those blowes vpon his Humane nature: nor Pilats, nor the Iewes, who were but instruments, but the originall and chiefe imploying them, which was

Gods Justice armed with vengeance for his sinne (His I may call it, for he paid for it.) Now this could not but make an unspeakeable impression of paine & sorrowes, w^{ch} sticke in the depth of his soule. Who then can say how litle or how small this was? Nay, who can declare or comprehend the infinit greatnes of it? Finally your self doth grant expressly that *the Wrath of God is Hell*: indeed only it ^b causeth Hell to be cruell. Yea you grant it to be sharper then Hell. So that we see heereby how vainly you say, *Out of this proposition, Christ suffered for vs the wrath of God for sinne, I shall never conclude: Ergo he suffered the true paines of Hell.* I have heere shewed you I trust that this followeth well, seeing the wrath of God which Christ felt in his Spirit was his right and proper wrath, albeit he suffered not all nor the wholl wrath of God, nor Hell locally, nor every part thereof iust as the Damned do. Which you without all colour of reason or likelyhood, would make men imagine to be the question betweene vs.

a Pag. 247

b 1^a. 30. 3

c Pag. 248

g² sup²w² a² c²no² t²p² J²

You ^d would make a Contradiction in my wordes for saying *Christ suffered in his wholl manhood*, and afterward *Christ suffered Gods Wrath properly and immediatly in his Soule*. Where I say not as you vntruly charge me, that, *he suffered all that he suffered in his whole manhood*. Wherefore this is a new contrariety. Again, granting him to suffer *all that he suffered in his wholl manhood*, yet he must suffer Gods wrath (as Gods wrath) *properly and immediatly in his Soule*, in his Body *mediatly* and by coniunction only with his Soule. And thus my reason ^e there framed is yet still wholly good and sound.

d Pag. 248

e Treat. 1.

f Treat. 1.

g Treat. 1.

Then I am charged with *absurdities*, I know not how many, nor how great. 1. ^a Because I say, *Christ assumed not our nature*, nor any part of it but only to suffer in it *properly and immediatly*. As if I ha^e meant heere, that he became man *not to reueale to vs by his own mouth his Fathers Will; not to worke righteousness for vs, not to quicken and sanctify vs, but only to suffer for vs, and nothing els*. Wherein who would have shewed himselfe so vnjust an Adversary, & so vnreasonable? Were it not reason and iust dealing to consider whereof we dispute, and so weighing the whole matter of our talke not to stretch and racke my words further then that. All may see it to be manifest, that ^b heere I speak only of Christs *suffering for our redemption*, having not one word about his other

h Pag. 248

i Treat. 1.

pag. 17.

k Treat. 1.

pag. 16.

pag. 17.

benefits which he wrought for vs. *And after speaking of Christs Soules suffering, I shew that although there were 2 sortes thereof, one *immediat and proper*, an other by *Sympathy from and with the flesh*, yet Christ tooke our Humane Soule only to suffer in it *properly & immediatly*: that is, his maine end was not that he should suffer in it by Sympathy from and with the body, and *onely so*, which you very strangely affirme. So that my meaning is no more but to exclude that which you affirme, *That Christ tooke his Humane Soule to suffer in it only from and by his Body*. This heere I denyed, and nothing els. For I grant that Christ intended that his Humane Soule should suffer by Sympathy: but yet also this he intended not directly nor primarily in taking the 2 distinct partes of our Humane nature our Soule and our Body. He intended it by consequence, because Natures right state was such in vs: therefore determining to be in nature like vs, he would also that his Soule should feele the Bodies outward harmes, as it doth with vs. Howbeit in comparison of the Soules most principall disposition, & of that which is proper to Reasonable Creatures, he did not respect the inferiour part, that which is common to vs with Beastes, even this sensitive suffering by Sympathy with and from the Body. I shew in comparison of the other Christ respected not this, yet he did respect this also, as I said, secondarily & consequently: that is because he intended to have our nature in whole and full perfection, as we have it, only except sinne. Now I beseech you would any vpright adversary object against me, that in this speech I exclude Christs doing righteousness in his Soule for vs &c. I appeale to all indifferent Readers. Rather hence we are to gather & to conclude, that each part in Christ ought to have the proper and immediat vse as is incident to the nature thereof, as well in suffering, as it is cleere that it hath in working-righteousnes. In Christes working of righteousness and obedience to God, his Soule had a proper and immediat part to do which it executed without the Body: as to conceive & meditate on the will of God revealed to him, to love and to obey so imbrace it, and to purpose the full performing of it, &c. His Body also had a proper and externall vse, not onely to follow the holy thoughts and purposes of his minde, but also to minister many outward occasions, & to drive them to the minde, whereby Christ wrought righteousness complicitly, and in his whole nature.

That which was by cooperation and mutuall coherence only of one part with the other, as it was a distinct kinde of working in the Soule and in the body also, so it was respected secondarily, and only because the true constitution of our nature requireth for which Christ meant wholly and perfectly to take vpon him. Whence now we may well argue, *As it was with him touching his faculty of doing righteousness and Obedience, so it was and ought to be touching his suffering Gods punishments for vs.* There is no reason in the world, nor likely hood, that the natural faculty in Christs Soule of proper and immediat suffering for our sinnes should have no vse, and a Suffering of paines onely by and from the body should be sufficient, when in his doing of righteousness for vs his Soules ioint Obedience and mutuall kinne together in & with his Body was not alone sufficient. *But there was further obedience found in the Soule of Christ, even that which was proper and immediat in it,* as before I said. Seeing then such a kind of Obedience was necessary for vs in Christs Soule, *therefore such a Suffering also even in the same kinde was necessary likewise.* This must needs be a perfit reason for vs against you, except you could by expresse Scripture disprove this proportion of like necessity betwene the operation of the proper faculties of Christes Humane Soule, that is betwene his Doing & Suffering for vs: which you shall never be able to do. And thus it appeareth I hope, that you had no cause so cruelly to rage at me for this as you do.

Nor yet for the next: where your charge me that *I conclude Christs flesh to be needles for our redemption.* A horrible Hæresie, But how do I say so much? Because I say, *His Soules suffering by Sympathy did not make properly to our redemption.* Ergo his Flesh was needles. I deny this sequēle: how can that follow? Touching the sense of my speech, you may remember how I have largely declared *Before* that the Soules proper suffering is greatly and iustly distinguished from the Common suffering that is by sympathy: And that the Soules suffering by Sympathy in Christ was intended by God, by reason that our naturall constitution doth require it to be in every true and perfit man, which Christ also was. And that it did make to our redemption, even as likewise his Infirmities, and Affections: as his Wearines, Hunger, Sleepe, Feare, Love, Joy, &c. These doe make to our redemption, not as intended in
Christis

a Pag. 350.

b Pag. 2.

Christ's incarnation *principally* and *primarily*, but *secondarily* and *by consequent*; because that Humane nature which God ordaind vnto him, and intended to be perfect in him, could not otherwise be thoroughly perfect as it is in vs, but with these common Affections & infirmities which other mortall Creatures have to, & not Man only. Also in Christ these Infirmities and Affections wrought not *immediately* for sinne; but vsually for other particular causes and occasions *immediately*. Nevertheless they were all even for sin in him *consequently*; that is because the perfection of Humane nature, which he assumed for sinne, and was in every point in him, as before I noted, required so. Even thus likewise in Christ: I say his Soules suffering by sympathy wrought in him *immediately* & *properly* for some other particular cause stirring that faculty, that is by reason of the Bodily paine & smart, which this sensitive power of the Soule apprehended & felt and caused the flesh also to feel. This suffering then of his Soule only by sympathy was *immediately* and *properly* not for our redemption from sin, but for the sensitive apprehending of the smart, woundes, and blowes, which the Iewes gave his body: & yet as before, I said *consequently* even this was for our sinne also, namely because these woundes were given him for our sinne. And thus, though it made for our redemption in such maner as it wrought in Christ because of our sinne, and as it was intended by Christ in taking both partes of our Nature, the Soule & the Body, yet this was not in a *direct* or *immediate* respect, and so not *properly* but by *consequent* as I have shewed.

Pag. 352.

Treat. 1.

Pag. 19.

Pag. 352.

After^a you charge me *lovely*, that I falsifie your Argument about receaving pollution from Adams. For where^b I frame your reason as grounded on that opinion that *only our flesh is derived from Adams and not our soule*,^c you renounce it vtterly and say you grounded no reason upon that difficulty: & so you made no such argument as beere I pretend. Which whether it be true or no, I report me to them that heard you. But then, what is your reason now? is it any otherwise grounded? No certainly, if you make any reason at all. Who triflcth then? and why doe you vpbraide me so much with trifling? Let vs see what is your reason now: *Our flesh is as able to redeeme vs, as Adams in condemning vs. But we inherit pollution from Adams flesh. Ergo. Doe we inherit pollution from Adams flesh, and is it not by Generation? How els do we*

TREATISE OF CHARITYS SUFFERING.

herit pollution & cōdemnatio from him. If there be no other way,
why doe you then serme to refuse the *difficult* question of our Ge-
neration; and yet urge the sequele thereof? For if our soules arise in
Generation from Adam as well as our flesh, how can your reason
be good by any possibility? It is best therefore vterly to omit this
reason, which you grant hath no ground but a great *difficulty* &
doubtfull question. I have shewed herefore at large that your ar-
gument (which heere is your Minor) is nothing true: For *pollution*,
that is, sin & reall iniquity is not in our flesh without a Soule. But
Ambrose saith, *We are defiled before we haue life*, I pray, omit mens
Authorities in this case, & prove by sound reason that which you
would. Neither is it cleere, as you say it is, that *pollution*
fro *Adams* flesh only. (This word *only* you must add, *as* you say
nothing against vs.) Our parents Soules are in cause as well as their
flesh, that sin is derived vnto vs. But you draw me to talke of these
intricat things, which I would in no wise meddle with. I pray, kepe
your promise better, not to meddle with this *difficultie*, neither to
make it any ground of your reason: which yet you do here nor with-
standing. Again you with one breath overthrow your self. For you
say, we haue pollution before the Soule cometh whence *seuer* it
cometh. Yea, whence *seuer*? What if the Soule doe come in & by
generation? You see how you crosse your self; who do so taunt me
for this fault, I hope, altogether vniustly. Then you will disprove
my Proposition: which is, whereby *Adam* first sinned by the same
Corist satisfied for sinne. You deny this, because the Scripture ac-
knowledgeth no satisfaction but by death: where still we must note
that you meane *only* by the *Beaily death*. Now how proove you
that? Because the iudge in prohibiting *Adam* to transgresse, threat-
ned death: In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt dye the
death. Which it seemeth if you avouch againe and againe. And are
you sure that *Death* heere is but the *bodily death* only, & no more?
Then surely the wicked should thank hee easilie for their finnes. Far
be it from me to vter such a sentence. Nevertheless, you must
give me leave to shew you also your contradiction in this point.
First in that where you acknowledge, & the Iudges revenge for
sinne is *Death both of body and soule*. Againe where you haue
with *athanasius* shewing expressly that this text intēdicat even
both these, *Anima dixit, Morte morietur, He said, to the Soule,*

H

Thou.

Treatise
pag. 22

pag. 20

pag. 20
d Treat.
pag. 20

Gen. 2
f Pa. 100

pag. 43
h Pag. 43

Thou shalt dy the death. But you would prove your matter againe
 by this; ^a *Through death, which was for our redemption, we receive
 the promise:* Yet he saith not, *Through his bodily death meere-
 ly and alone,* and by nothing els together therewith, which is your
 intent. He excludeth not *the Soules proper sufferings,* as ^b I have
 often said: the contrarie heereof you never come neere to proove.
 And it must not be forgotten, that ^c heere you renounce all satis-
 faction for sinne in respect of merit as from Christes soule vnterly.
 Therefore that absurd speech and worse which you ^d vniu'stly cast
 on me, proveth in very deed to be your owne: that *Christes suffer-
 ing in Soule by Sympathy makes not to our redemption.* Your own
 place in *Barnard* maketh *Christes whole Soule* that is the Minde,
 and the part depending on the Body also, to have place and part in
 the meritorious sacrifice, as well as the Body. ^e *Ut totum hominem
 saluum fecit, sic de Totā se hostiam fecit salutarem.* Which suteth
 not with your wordes, *The Soule of Christ which could not dye,
 could not pay the satisfaction: and nothing might satisfie for sinne, but
 death.* Yea all your ^f other places of Contradiction herevnto must
 be taken in good part. As for your reason, *That nothing may sa-
 tisfie for sinne but death,* it is not sound. The Scriptures doe shew in
 deed that Christ should not satisfie without *Death:* but they deny
 not that there are other partes of Christes Satisfaction, which dif-
 fer from *Death:* As his *bloudshed,* and besides that Christes *Pove-
 tie,* his *hunger,* his *wearines,* his *shame,* his *reproches,* his *apprehen-
 sion,* his *buffeting,* &c. These doubtles, yea all other suffringes of
 Christ whatsoever, small or great, are satisfactorie & meritorious.
 You will say, you vnderstand all these and such like in the *Death*
 of Christ. You may vnderstand what you list: but who will grant
 in proper speech that these are his *Death,* or that his *death* is any or
 all these. And if you take Christes death by the *Figure Synecdo-
 che,* a part of Christes sufferings for the whole, then why doe you
 so much abhorre that Figure heere, and why may not *the Soules
 proper sufferings* be admitted also into the worke of Christes Sa-
 tisfaction, although it can not properly dye? Where you nippe me
 also for saying that the Soule of Christ in some kinde of sense dy-
 ed: I hope in due place you shall have a reasonable answer to that
 matter. Till then have patience, I pray. And thus ^h you come to
 scan my *Assumption* also, that *sed datus commissus fuit missus* pro-
 pty

Hebr. 9. 15.

Treat. 1.
pag. 8, 9.

Pag. 253.

Pa. 250. &c.

Pag. 84

ag. 85, 86,
&c.

g. 41. &c.

g. 253.

perly in his Soule. Which you graunt in one sense is true, but directly repugnant to my Conclusion. How I pray? *b* If I meane that *b* Pag. 114
Adams Soule transgressed the Comandement with her body and by her body, that is, the Soule as agent, the Body as the Instrument, the conclusion will follow in spite of my heart, Ergo in satisfying for sinne Christs Soule must be punished with her body and by her body: which is the thing I labour to overthrow with all the wits I have.

Nay, then the Conclusion will follow that the immortall part the Minde was punished peculiarly, and not by and from the Body onely: seeing in all even outward sinnes the Soule sinneth, both principally, and also in a proper and peculiar maner by it selfe, yea before the body sinneth. Albeit the Body sinneth also secundarily, and in a maner proper to it selfe: even as the *Instrument*, as you say. Yea further I meane that some sinnes the Soule acteth in and by it selfe meereley: and therefore it suffereth likewise some punishments meereley in it selfe, which touch not the Body at all, vnlesse by Sympathy only, and that only when they grow vehement. But all this you heere deny: teaching that the Soule properly committeth no sinne but by and with the body: that is, the Soule in it self & by it selfe alone sinneth not. And so consequently that God temporally and eternally punnisheth the Soule only by the Body. This is the true effect of your discourse heere. For prooffe of the first you say, *c* Pag. 115
God did not say to Adam, thou shalt not like it, or desire it which the Soule of Adam did, but thou shalt not eat thereof, which could not be performed but by the hand and mouth of Adam. And therefore Adam transgressed the Comandement not by his Soule, but by his Body, even as in murder, theft, and adultery: these factes men commit by their Bodies and not by their Soules. And after, All provocations and pleasures of sinnes the Soule taketh from her Body: all actes of sinne she committeth by her body. Both which speeches are exceeding vntrue and hurtfull. For even in these sinnes the Soule as I said sinneth principally and peculiarly before that the Body sinneth at all. Yea the Desiring and Liking of evell is sinne, before the outward Act is obsummat and finished. This Paul understood at length when he became a Christian; though a long while being a Pharisee, he knew it not. And it seemeth, this was in Christs time the Hæresie of the Pharisees: against whom he sheweth, that not only the outward fact of Bodily sinne was sinne, but

Very strange doctrine

c Pag. 115
d The first den fin

e Rom.

also^a even the very *thoughts* and *liking* towards sinne. Wherefore
 Adam was as well forbidden to desire or like that fruit, as to eat it,
 which you deny. The Commandement was naturally ingraven
 in Adams heart in his Creation. Which since, Moses maketh dis-
 tinct and diuerse from all the rest, which concerne the outward
 acte. Therefore distinctly he saith, *Thou shalt not desire or covet*.
 So that to desire the forbidden fruit was sinne, even without and
 before the acte of eating. Moreover other foule sinnes, Heresies,
 Turcisme, and Atheisme are committed and determined simply in
 the minde, without any necessary imployment of any partes of the
 Body. As touching Heresies, to hold *Two first causes of thinges a*
Good and a Bad, *God and the Divell* with Manichee: also that
Christ the Redeemer was not God with Arius: that the *Holy Ghost*
is not God with Eunomius &c: that *Christ had no Soule* with Apo-
 linaris: that *Christes Manhood was confounded and changed into*
his Godhead with Eutyches, or *divided from his Godhead* with
 Nestorius: or the opinion of *Ubiquity* or of *Transubstantiation*.
 Finally that *there never was nor shalbe any Christ a Redeemer* as
 the Turkes hold, that *there is no God* as the Atheists. Nowe are
 there not many provocations to hatch and to conclude these opi-
 nions meere in the minde & soule of man? Are there not many
 pleasures even in these impieties meere in the minde? Yea it is
 evident to all that the meere Thoughts, the Vnderstanding & de-
 termination of the only Soule of man doth act them & resolvethe
 on them in it self, without any concurrence or cooperation of the
 body therein. Happily you will say, The Soule takes occasion so to
 thinke by some outward bodily thinges before seene or heard. I
 deny not but the Soule taketh occasion to thinke many things by
 the bodily senses. Howbeit not all thinges simply. And so are the
 Fathers^b heere to be vnderstood. If any will stumble on that of
 Aristotle, *Nihil est in intellectu quod non fuit prius in sensu*, it is not
 absolutly nor vniversally true. My reason is, because Philosophers
 thought the minde to be as it were *Tabula ab rasa* when we come
 into the world first. They knew not the naturall Pride, the impie-
 tie, and perversity of mans soule, which may yeeld many and lund-
 dry Thoughts and Determinations to sinne, yea provocations and
 pleasures in sin which the Body ministrerh not, neither could the
 Heathen vnderstand them. And to say that this pride, impiety, and
 perversitie

pro-
 prian and
 so. in your
 355.

pervertite was taken by contagion from the *steele* flesh originally in Generation, is not to be proved. And yet were that so, notwithstanding the Soule *Afterward* can *act* many *sinnes* *merely* *in* *it* selfe and without the cooperation of the body. Further, as the Angells sinned in the beginning by their meere spirituall conceit against God, so nothing letteth but that man in his Angell-like nature (the reasonable Soule) may sinne likewise without any Bodily meanes thereinto. Also, as we can thinke well without using our body, God so inspiring vs: so may we thinke ill, which is sinne) our owne inborne corrupt vnderstanding and reason and will moving vs only. Moreover if I grant you this point of Heathen Philosophy, that the Soule taketh occasion to thinke all thinges which she thinketh vniuersally from the body & bodily objectes; yet it followeth not that she taketh occasion to misthinke from thence alwayes. The proper provocations and pleasures of sinne are oftentimes noboutward at all: but the meere pervertie and malignity of our evill minde is vsually the very cause of ill thoughts & ill determinations. I grant also that the occasion is often taken from the outward senses. But it is meere taken, not given: taken by the corrupt and perverse minde, not given by the senses. Which though they be also otherwise corrupt, yet simply in seeing naturall things they sinne not, nor yet in hearing, nor in tasting, save as the minde which is properly and principally, and first sinfull, abuses their operation. And as touching those wretched *men* *of* *the* *East* opinions before rehearsed, doubtles their presumptuous and perverse wit only so reasoning and concluding fallily without any other proper inducements from without, was the very cause of those spirituall impieties in many *impes* of *Sathan*. Wherefore for you to affirme that the Soule committeth all acts of sinne by the body, & that God did not forbid *Adam* to like or desire that fruit, is more then strange doctrine. Somewhere most iniquiously by you reproch *parity*: I dare say heere you have no colour of purity in this point. Notwithstanding you resolutely for your selfe prove your opinion, not by Scripture, but by Fathers: who are answered before, saving *Tertullian*, who you say pointeth to a place of Scripture for *it* *out* *of* *the* *heart* *came* *evill* *thoughts*. But this place being considered will rather prove the contrary. For Christ heere meaneth not by Heart any parte of the Body, but meere *the* *mind* *and* *not* *the* *Soule*

255. *Soule* of man, and that with opposition to the body in this case of
 sinning. For thus in effect hee saith, Not the Body sinneth by ta-
 king in, but the Soule by sending out. That is to say, The Soule
 only sinneth properly, & not the body at all no not in grosse facts,
 except as the body is the Instrument, the Soule being the Agent,
 as your selfe doe speake. Otherwise the body sinneth not at all,
 much lesse in such thoughts as are meere spirituall, vnles wee
 meane by sociery, & for coniunctions sake in one person with the
 Soule, w^{ch} indeed is it that sinneth. And thus some have thought,
 those places of Tertullian which you cite may be vnderstood. But
 indeed Tertullian you vse not well, and bring these his wordes a-
 gainst his own meaning, as anon we shall further see. That which
 256. you ad of Bodily infirmities letting the operation of the Soule (for
 so I thinke you meane) as in Lerhargies, Apoplexies, Sleepe,
 Phrensy, &c. Peradventure, then it thinketh and considereth more
 freely in it selfe and by it selfe, then when the body setteth it on
 worke otherwise at other times. Howsoever, it can never be pro-
 ved that the Soule then vtterly ceaseth operation, and can do no-
 thing: for it seemeth that only our *memory and sensitive faculties*
 are stopped, whereby it cometh to passe that we know nothing
 afterwards what the minde contemplateth and thinketh in such
 cases. It is very rare when we remember something, and by some
 extraordinary loosing of those obstructions it is, which common-
 ly doe possesse our senses wholly in such occasions. Yet even those
 small remnants of such operations of our Soule being in such
 state, doe evidently conuince that the Soules operations hang not
 necessarily on the body, neither is it idle when the body is hin-
 dred, though commonly and for the most part we remember little
 thereof. Lastly, if the Soules operations were so necessarily tyed to
 the faculties and instrumentes of the body as you doe avouch, I
 greatly doubt howe the Soules immortallitie will bee defended a-
 gainst the effect of your assertion. Surely it bringeth in with it the
 Heresia of Pope Iohn the 12. and of certaine Anabaptistes, that
 the Soule hath no being till when it shall resume the body at the
 last day. And hence also it is that you say, *Gods iustice punisheth*
 257. *the soule (only) by the body*, that is, not till the Resurrection. This
 (only) the effect of your speach contrayneth plainly and fully. Yet
 in truth thus you must needs affirme and hold: you can not avoid
 it.

it, if you will hold your maine Question. Only except you deny that Christo had a Humane Soule perfit in all the powers and facultyes thereof, like ours, or els that God did not properly punish Christ for our finnes. Of necessitie you must fall into one of these dangerous evils; for ought that I yet see. Wherefore this point is not so easie nor so evident to the simple as you pretend: and I thinke you had neede of better reasons then hitherto I see any you have, before the Godly and Learned will beleve you.

● The rather for that in deed heere you commit further & grievous faultes. 1. *Tertullian* your owne authour, & the principall ground which you have for your opinion heere, is wonderfully ill used.

2. You are strangely contrary to your selfe in your very winding vp of the matter. As for *Tertullian*, he resolveth directly contrary to the wordes which you cite from him. Saith he, *The example of Lazarus in the Gospell proveth that Mens Soules though alone and without their bodies, are punished, and comforted, in the world of the dead. The Soule shall lacke the reviviting of the flesh with it, not for that it can not feele any thing without the flesh, but for that it must needes heereafter feele also with the flesh. For as much as it sufficeth by it selfe to doe somewhat, so much, or so farre also it sufficeth to suffer. It sufficeth indeed to doe losse by it selfe. For it is able of it selfe only, so I thinke, so Will, so Desire, so Dispose: but to accomplish, it looketh for the use of the body. So therefore it also looketh for the societie of the body, that by it the Soule may as well suffer absolutely, as without it she could not doe things compleatly. And therefore for what actions it sufficeth by it selfe, the iudgement of the same it receaveth (now) that is, Of the Desire, of the Thoughtes, of the Will, that it had. Thus Tertullian directly answereth to that Conclusion and reasons which you gather out of him, proving contrary to the same that the Soule now without the flesh receaveth iudgement for such actions as of it selfe it was sufficient to doe: and it is sufficient to doe certaine actions of it selfe, as I thinke, to Will, to Desire, to Order, and to Dispose things, but to accomplish, it is not able (namely outward actions) the iudgement of which actions indeed the Soule shall tary for till the reviviting againe of the flesh therewith. It seemeth that Tertullian cited before the reasons of the Heretikes, holding that the Soules slept till the last iudgement, and received no reward at all in the meane time, for want of the*

a Pag. 189

b De Res.
carn. e.
Animas
torqueri
rique
turalc Pag.
d Pag.e Such
fom
Pope

soci-

the after-
ward, & the
Anabaptistes
are now still

societie of their flesh, which till then lieth rotten in the Grave: but
here *Tertullian* answereth and rebounceth all this same. And so
those were the *Hemlockes* wordes against *Tertullian*, which you al-
leage out of him in steed of *Catholike*. Which dealing what it is,
I leave to be considered. Next your owne contradictorie deal-
ling in this place, is also not to be forgotten. For your selfe shut-
teth vp with an excellent reason against your selfe, almost the same
that I observed presently before in *Tertullian* against your collec-
tion. Thus you say, *Doe I denie then that the Soule hath any suf-
ferings in this life and the next, which come not by the body? By no
meanes. The Soule hath some proper punishments in this life, as sor-
rowe and feare when the body hath no hurt, from which Christ was
not free, as appeareth by his Agonie: and so in the next the Soules of
the wicked have griefe & remorse, besides the paine of fire, &c. Yes
surely; I suppose you denied before the Soules punishment with-
out the Body. But now you seeme to graunt it. And, seeing you
graunt also, that nothing is more proportionable to Gods iustice, the
to retayne the same order in punishing which they kept in offending.
Therefore it foloweth by your owne words, that the wicked some-
times sinned meereley in and by their Soules, and not onely toge-
ther with and by their Bodies: seeing they are punished simply in
and by their Soules, and not onely with and by their bodies. Also,
how sound this is, I wot not: where you yeeld some punishment
now to the Damned: howbeit none other real and positive pu-
nishment but remorse and remembrance of sinne onely, as it see-
meth. Again in saying that *Christ* was not free from some proper
punishments to the soule, as *Sorrow* and *Pena* in his agonie: if you
meane as you speak, that those were proper punishments inflicted
on him by Gods very Wrath, (and not to be onely his holy affec-
tions *Devotion* to God, and *compassion* to men, which yet I feare is
your meaning) then it foloweth evidently from your own words,
that *Christ* suffered proper punishment in his Soule from the verie
wrath of God, more then the Bodily sufferings only, or by Sympa-
thy in the Soule: which in a word is the granting of our whol que-
stion. All the rest that you adde out of the Fathers, touching *Hell*
and *Hell* paines, is to no purpose. If you are them to proove
that *Christ* had no naturall feare of Death and Hell, you gain say
that your selfe further then we doe, for then the truth is*

pag. 157.

pag. 158.

pag. 157.

before
pag. 18.

pag. 158.

pag. 159.

Then

Then * you come to my other Reasons which I called *Speciall*, a Pag. 56
not for more excellency in them then in the other, except onely
that I take these to bee *not so General* as the former, but more
neerly to touch our Question. Which you might perceave well
enough to have ben my meaning, by the expresse Opposition that
* I make of *General* and *Speciall*. But it appeareth you had rather
take my wordes so as that you may make them to serve your vn-
seemely jesting and better inveying humour; which yet in the
end will helpe your cause but little.

b Treat. 2
pag. 14

Against * my Reason out of *Isay*, that Christ suffered those
paines and sorrowes for sinne which els we should have borne; you
except that I expresse not whether I meane *All* or *Some*. I answer,
All and every whit I meane so far as possiblility will admit; and na-
mely as touching the very sorrowes and paine. Nothing was aba-
ted in the nature and vehemency of the paine which hee suffered,
any more then is abated in the paine and sorrows of the Damned.
This the very text heere expresseth with great * emphasis, * *Hee*
susteyned our very sorrows, or our sorrowes themselves. And this we
conclude the rather, because the sense of paines and sorrows * only
was the Ransom ordayned and consecrated by God in Christ, that
by them his sufferings should be accomplished, & our sinnes satis-
fied. Whatsoever therefore in this life might be painfull & was due
to mankind generally for sin, & in it owne nature was no sin, that
Christ suffered *wholly* and *altogether* for vs, even *the same* which
els we should. Which is your own * plaine confession also. I grant
indeed it vterly impossible that he who was vncapable of sinne,
yea God himselfe, should be really separated from God, or Hated,
or weakened in faith, or punished externally. Yet it was possible
that even he on whom our sinne was laid should feelee both *pro-
perly* in Soule, and also in Body all the whole vehemency of our
due paine, and the sharpenes of our smart. Paine, affliction, & sor-
row is not sinne be it small or great: it is indeed properly and ori-
ginally the Punishment of sinne either in vs or in others. Christe
suffered Punishment for sinne not in himselfe, as others do, but by
Gods ordinance he suffered punishment *extraordinarily* for sinne
in vs. When God smote him, it was possible for him to feelee it, yea
vpossible it was that he should not feelee it, and of necessitie his
Soule peculiarly, properly, & infinitely did feelee the stroke of Gods
wrath.

c Which
faire in-
tations
ad. do
fully
vms.
d 16-17
e 18-19

f pa. 56

wrathful iustice. The vehemency whereof may wound and pierce
 not lesse even in this life where God will, then in the locall Hell it
 selfe. All these our due sorrowes therefore, and all this our shate-
 pest deserved paine, even Gods owne immediat hand limiting the
 Soule for sinne, (which far exceedeth and comprehendeth as it
 were all other paine) Christ without any dispensation or qualifi-
 cation whatsoever, indured for vs. This is that which we say: and
 thus Ierom also expoundeth this very text: Saith hee * *Quod nos
 pro nostris debebamus sceleribus sustinere ille pro nobis passus est.*
 Turne nowe your vaine and frivolous insultation against Ierom
 for his indefinit speech, to whom it pertayneth in this case as well
 as to me, if you be not a respecter of persons. Say to him, * *You
 may do well (S^r Ierom) to go to the Univerſitie againe, whence you
 came afore you were wise, and there learne to put quantity to your
 propositions, that we may know when you speak of any thing whether
 you meane All or Some.* But Ierom would be wise enough to an-
 ſwer you (if he were alive) that (wherſoever he studied) he knew so
 much, that in learning and reason an indefinit proposition is to be
 taken as Vniverſall in a neceſſary matter, * as the vnder-taking of a
 Surety is in his ſtead whom he is ſurety for: and yet namely but ſo
 far as known poſſibility admitteth, and indeed no further. Now
 this is apparant in this caſe of Chriſtes ſuretyſhip and ſuffering in
 our ſteed: Hee ſuffered all the whole puniſhment of ſinne due to
 mankind, whatſoever was poſſible for him being a ſinles man, &
 alſo very God, to ſuffer. And further then this none will imagin or
 thinke that any (vnles mad men) do affirme. You charge mee
 hereafter that I falſify this place of Ierom, becauſe * I did put
 in *maledictum* with his wordes. Which is a ſilly deviſe to turne of
 Ierom without anſwer. For by it I expreſſe Ieroms meaning: * his
 wordes have plaine reference to *maledictum* in the 8 Apoſtle, who
 he cited immediatly before. This is the none other but an honeſt
 falſifying of mine Authour. Now that this place of *Iſay*, and the
 whole doctrine w^{ch} I avouch touching theſe ſufferinges of Chriſt
 for vs, may the better be received, let vs note that the publicke do-
 ctine appointed by Authority to be taught throughout England
 expreſſeth the very ſame. Namely *Anglicke Catechiſme*, wherein it
 thus taught. *He paid and ſuffered the paine due to vs, and by the
 meanes delivered vs from the ſame. Neither is it varied amongſt*

rom. in
 1. 53.

ag. 260.

a ſpeciall
 ſanctifying
 gods vnto
 all iuſtice

350.
 eat. 1.
 85.
 Curſe.
 I put it
 in (Ma-
 dictum)
 with a pa-
 raphraſis.
 god enim.
 Gal. 3. 13.

which Au-
 thorie I have
 cited & ex-
 cited Treat.
 88. 89.
 the anſwer

TREATISE OF CHRISTES SUFFERINGS.

87

Use to promise, and to be surety: yea sometime to suffer for an other,
 But with Christe as our Surety so suffering for vs. God dealt as it
 were with extremity of law: but to vs whose sinnes deserved punish-
 ments, & due paines be laid on Christ, he used singular lenity, gentle-
 nes, clemency, and mercy. Christ therefore suffered, and in suffer-
 ing overcame death, the paine appointed by the overliving God for
 mens offense. Againe, His Will was to suffer All extremities for vs,
 who had deserved all extremities. All those things being taken upon
 himselfe he destroyed them all. Where make also what doctrine
 the Law of this Realme consonantly publisheth and commandeth
 in the Homilies of Christs Passion. See whether it misliketh yours,
 or no. The Hom: maketh Christs putting himselfe betweene Gods
 deserved Wrath and our sinne the extreamest part of his Passion.
 If this were the extreamest part of his Passion, then it was a further
 feeling then the sense of Bodily paine only, it cannot be any other
 then his feeling of Gods proper Wrath spiritually, which our sinne
 deserved. Therefore by the Homily hee felt Gods proper Wrath
 spiritually which our sinne deserved. Againe, he bare All our sinnes,
 sores and infirmities upon his owne backe. No paine did he refuse to
 suffer in his owne body. But as he felt All this in his Body, so
 hee must feele the greatest part primarily and much more deeply
 in his Soule. Ergo hee refused not to suffer All the paines of the
 Wrath of God both in Body and Soule. * Hee tooke upon him the
 reward of our sinnes, the iust reward of sinne. But this same Homily
 saith, The reward of our sin was the iust Wrath and indignation of
 God, the death both of Body and Soule. Therefore by the Homily,
 Christ tooke on him for vs the iust wrath & indignation of God,
 the death both of body & soule. And thus also * my text of Scrip-
 ture is iustified, That Christ gave himselfe the price of redemption
 for vs, which we els should have paid. Where * you except against
 this text in Timoth: that I say, The Scripture speaketh heere after
 the common vse & custom of redeeming captives taken in warrs:
 when a captive being not able, some other friend payeth Antilytron
 the same price for the captive which els he should. You aske, who
 told me that the Scripture speaketh after the common vse of ene-
 mies? I answer, The nature of the worde Antilytron a Ransom im-
 poneth so much, which is properly used in such cases. Where also
 you please to inferre, that I forsooth doe hold with your opinion

with to it
a word.

b Hom.

c Hom.

* 1. Thim.
pag. 34.
d 2. Tim.
e Pa. 266.

ag. 461.
52.

pag. 68. 69.

pag. 68.

Treat. 1.

ag. 45.

Mat. 5. 25.

ag. 162.

Wherein on-
ly this simili-
tude may, &c.
be found.

that * Christ paid the price of our Redemption (properly) to the Divell, and not to God. For this is it that heere you meane: & this, though now in print you deliver it nothing so largely and emphatically as you preached it, yet this still in effect you maintaine in certain ^b words out of *Ambrose*, which is passing strange to heare. But how do I ioyne to your opinion heerein? because I vrge that the enemy must haue a price for his Captive. I pray, who is that enemy which must bee satisfied? The Divell? God forbid. Though I see that * you over earnestly do thus professe: yet God knoweth it is far from ^d my heart so to thinke. Gods Iustice only is that *offended enemy, to who our Ransom was paid: it was not paid to the Divell who was but Gods slave & executioner. Against which what reason have you? Surely not the shaddow of any. As for the names of *Ambrose* or *Austin* they are of no waight to warrant such a doctrine as those words pretend. And I am out of doubt that the Fathers in following an *Allegory*, do but play with the Figure, as there vse is oftentimes: they speak not exactly heere as meaning indeed to teach such a doctrine. Or if they did, then we are to learne by their good leaves how to speake and thinke more wholesomly (then they do) out of the Scripture. If they or an Angell from Heaven should teach so in earnest as they pretend, we ought to forsake them. As for the point whether it draw any thing neere to Manichisme or no, let other iudge. Then ^f you would shew that this similitude of a Captives paying his Ransom by his friend, is not like to Christes Redeeming vs: because Captives themselves are appointed to perpetuall imprisonment or servitude vnles a sufficient Ransom be paid for them, and then the Ransomer is not bound to be prisoner himselfe for them, but satisfieth the enemy in money or otherwise. Wherein verily you fit this similitude to my desire further then my selfe at first did expresse. For thus wee may now plainly see how it is possible that Christ our Ransomer might pay that ~~whole~~ price for vs which we els should have paid but could never discharge: and yet that hee neede not in such Redeeming of vs enter into our whole condition absolutely & to become a perpetuall prisoner in our stead, seeing we see that this is not exacted by enemies for their Captives in the Ransomers hand. Only that * price of money which the Captive should but cannot pay, the very same is paid by the Ransomer. ^g It obtayneth.

Then you let drive at my 2 Reason out of the Apostle: *Christ redeemed vs from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for vs.* Because I say, *What Curse can this be meant but the Curse of the Law,* that is even Gods Curse against sinne, whereof the Apostle hath altogether spoken heere before. Yea therefore indeed I demand againe, what reason or likely hood is there by the text to take this Curse to be in nature an other from the former, both being so closely and ioyntly mentioned together? ^b You make a very maine difference betweene them, by comparing this *Curse* laid on Christ wth those Curses wherewith God sometimes is said to Curse his senseles Creatures for wicked mens sake. But this is verily far fetcht, it is altogether another thing, very incomparable to the Curse w^{ch} Christ suffered. This is a most *improper curse*, not felt at all by the things accursed: yet called a Curse by similitude only, as the image of a man is called a man. There is no colour to make the Curse which Christe suffered for our sinnes like to the Curse which senseles creatures doe sometimes beare for mans cause. But you make a reason ^c to prove Moses particular Curse in *Deuteron: Cursed is he that is hanged,* (which Paul also applyeth to his purpose saying, *Christ was made a Curse for vs to redeeme vs from the Curse of the Law,*) so be not all one with this *Curse of the Law* in Paul. Neither yet did I, neither do I say, that it was *all one*. This I said and say still, that *they are both of one & the same nature*: that is true and *proper* Curses of God, not any *improper* Curse, nor onely esteerned a Curse by men. One was *the whole*, the other a *part*: but both of them *the true & proper Curses of God*. To vnderstand this more plainly, Paul saith not as you affirme, that Christ was made *that Curse only*, that *Iudiciall Curse* whereof only Moses speaketh: Paul doth not vnderstand it in the same measure that Moses mentioneth and no further. But this hee doeth; handling before generally Gods Curse and the punishment of the Law against sinne, and shewing that we are redeemed from it by Christs being made the same for vs, he confirmeth it by applying Moses Iudiciall punishment against certaine transgressours (^e beeing it seemeth a Figure of Christ heerein,) *That all they were accursed, which were hanged*: that is they which were hanged by the iust sentences of the Law, they were heerein *Accursed*, that is they heerein *sustained the Lawes true and deserved punishments*. Now by ap-

a Gal. 3.

b Pag. 86.
283.c Pag. 87.
d Deut. 21.e As of
who
others
mean
Lamb.

plying this text of Moses in this sense, & in this respect, to Christ being made the Curse of God for vs, it is well confirmed to be in nature and veritie the *true and proper Curse of the Law* which Christ was made for vs: for such also indeed was the nature of that Iudiciall Curse of Moses, though but a *parte* of the *whole*. And so as before I said the Apostle applying that which was but a *parte*, he may soundly and well shew what was the nature of that Curse in Christ, though in him it were the *whole*. For a *parte* and the *whole* of any thing differ not in nature, but in quantitie. Now vnderstand *Chrysostome* thus, as *b*efore we have distinguished the punishment of Christ and of the Damned, and then we differ not, Where he saith they were *diuers* Curses in Christ & in the Damned, take him to signifie *diuers matters* of one and the same Curse in Nature, or Christes Death and Moses Iudiciall hanging on the tree, to be only *diuers degrees*, or *measures* of one & the same Curse in nature, & so he saith the same altogether that we do. For these in their proper nature be all one, that is *proper* Punishments from God for sin, yet either in the *measure & degree*, or in the *manner & condition* of their suffering, they are very diuers & exceeding far a sunder. *Austin* on whom *d*you triumph, is stretched beyond his meaning. He dealeth against a *Manichee* who denyed that Christ had true Humane flesh: w^h yet notwithstanding is manifest, because Christ truly dyed. Now he proveth that Christ truly dyed, because the Apostle saith, *He was made a Curse for vs in that he hanged on the tree*. And where it is said Cursed is every one that hangeth on the tree, this was saith he to shew that Christ was not exempted, but was like other men truly accursed and truly dead. So that his meaning is not to shew that Christes whole Curse and his bodily death were iust all one without any difference, which you vrge him for: nay he hath no such meaning. Only he proveth by this that he being made truly a Curse, did also truly Dy, which the *Manichee* denyed. For in saying, *Christ was dead, & accursed for vs, is the same*, he meaneth it is the same for his purpose, the one very well proveth the other: but not that they were simply all one. The rest of your Fathers are altogether idly cited: no man denyeth that which they say.

Where you mislike me for saying, *That the Curse laid vpon Christ was not onely the ignominie of his death, & the shame of the world*

you have nothing against it, but much for it. *Austin* whom you
boast of is against you in this, saying: *a Christ beere took on him
our punishments without sinne.* But our punishment, which is with-
out sinne, doubles was a great deale more then only the disho-
nour and shame of the world. *Austin* therefore is manifestly a-
gainst you in this: yea also *b* your owne selfe is in saying likewise.
Austin and *Chrysostome*, and *c* other doe say that Christ suffered
this ignominie: but that this was all or the whole Curse which hee
suffered, I see none that affirmeth. Your many Scriptures in this
place, what doe they? Forsooth they prove that it is light as Mid-
day. For who ever made question, but that shame and reproch in
their simple Nature, were a parte of the true Curse of God? Yet all
this sheweth not that Shame was the whole Curse which Christ
indured. *e* You mislike that *f* I said Christes dying simply, *as the
godly dy*, may in no sort be called a Curse or *Accursed*: Because as
I affirme also, *h* *Death to the godly is no Curse properly nor punish-
ment of sinne, but a benefit and advantage.* Now, therefore Christes
Death was properly a Curse, because his Death was *i* not like
theirs. You say, *I am too young a Doctor to controll St Austin here-
in.* And I say, you are a Doctor not old enough to prove *Austin*
k *contrary to me* in this point. Death in it owne nature and in the
originall propertie of it, is a part of the Curse, and so Christ suffe-
red it: but in the Godly it is not properly a Curse, not the proper
punishment or revenge of sinne, which Christ once & alone hath
wholly sustayned and cleane freed vs of for ever. This your selfe
(as well as *m* I) can tell, saying: *The vengeance of the Lawe once
executed on our Surety, can no more in Gods iustice be executed on
vs.* And this our publike doctrine in England set forth by Mat-
ther Nowell confirmeth: By Christes death it is come to passe that to
the faithfull Death is now not a Destruction, but as it were a remo-
ving and changing of life, and a very short and sure passage to hea-
ven. Who also in *n* another place expresth it thus, *Death of the
body, which without Christ was the gate to Hell, is now by Christ
made to all that beleve in him the gate and passage to Heaven: So
that death which before was a Punishment, is now by Christ become
a vantage.* Wherein you are notably contradicted, who doe call
p *Death in the godly, the gate of Hell: a strange and most vntue
translation.* Again, you are *q* *gainsaide* in this place, when you
reprove

e Pag. 20

b Pag. 20

c Pag. 20

d Pag. 20

e Pag. 20

f Treat. 20

g Pag. 41

h That is

Christ had

ed simply

which in

he did not

h Pag. 44

i As before

Pag. 12

49, 50, 51

k Your selfe

with him

me here

49. Com

mors be

bona, ma

mala.

l Pag. 90

m Pag. 41

n Nowell

techie

suffered

der, 34

p Pag. 19

216.

q Pag. 20

209.

Pag. 170.

reprove me for affirming, that *Death to the godly and faithfull is a benefite and advantage*. Then you say, *If I will reason what death is in it selfe, I must resolve it to be a part of Gods Curse*. Which is no answer. For our question is not, *what death is in it selfe*. Who ever denied it to be in it selfe, as you say, *a part of Gods Curse for sinne*: but my expresse wordes are, *Death to the godly is no Curse properly, but a vantage*. Where^a you adde, *If Death were a gaine to the godly, as I would have it, by what meanes, I pray you, came it so to be?* If you know not, why did you not marke better the publike Catechisme before rehearsed, where all England is taught that it came by meanes of the death and resurrection of Christ. You say, *If by the resurrection of Christ conquering Death and changing the nature of it, then till Christ was risen, Death was a punishment to the faithfull themselves*. I wonder what meaning there is in this argument. As well you may say, There were none saved till Christ was risen. For salvation also and forgiveness of sinnes to all men, came only by the death and resurrection of Iesus Christ. So that thus, till Christ came in the flesh, none of the holy Patriarkes, *Abraham, David*, and the rest, obtayned eternall life. And what became of them then? But I am perswaded, that *Abraham, David*, and all the Prophetes dying before Christ was exhibited in the flesh, yet by their faith in Gods sure ordinance and promise, they had and enioyed Christ truly incarnat, slaine, and risen againe: and this to them was as effectually then, as it is now to vs since the actual performance of these things. Whereby even as we by faith, so they by the same faith (differing onely in the circumstance of time) were truly and thoroughly saved. Likewise to the faithfull then, by the efficacie of their holy faith, Death was properly no punishment but a gaine, even as to vs now it is. Further, ^byou except against me touching innocentes and Martyrs executions, *who^c I say, are most blessed*. You reply, *Their Martyrdomes are shamefull deaths, and that is a kinde of Corporall Curse*. A kinde of Curse? Who denyeth that? We know all shame & affliction to all men is a kinde of Curse. But neither shame nor Death to the holy Martyrs are ^daccounted by God nor by his servauntes as *proper and true Curses*, but the holy men are in trueth most glorious and blessed in them. Againe, the Saints and Martyrs can not bee properly *Cursed* and properly *Blessed* too, in any measure. Neither

Pag. 175.

Treat. 1.

pag. 181.

before pag.
p. 50.

their Soules blessed, vnles their *bodies* be blessed also, & free from the true Curse: although you seeme to denie this point. Which strange and vncouth assertion, both heere and in many places mo, you doe at least insinuat: that is, that the godly in their *Soules* are blessed, but in their *bodies* they still retaine Gods true & proper Curse, till the resurrection, Which I leave to the consideration of the godly. You say, *We must call things by those Names which God first allotted them.* That I deny, If God since evidently have altered them, and disposed of them otherwise. But he hath so don in this case. The afflictions and death which originally and naturally were punishments for sinne, and are so still to the wicked, the same to the godly (as I have often said) are since changed, & now are properly Chastisements of sinne, and not Punishments nor Curses. Only Christ hath suffered the whole proper punishment, and true Curse or Vengeance of our sinnes: and therefore on vs it is not, it can not be laid againe in any part thereof. You^a avouch a Pag. 90 some that denie Christ to have bene made a Curse or sinne. But you must remember^b your owne place of *Austin: Maledictum est omne peccatum, siue ipsum quod fit, siue ipsum supplicium.* b Pag. 90 The Curse is all sinne, which is twofold, either that which we commit against Gods law, or els the very Punishment of that sinne. Nowe^c your testimonies do meane, Christ was not made a Curse, or sin the first way, that is, he was not in him selfe sinfull nor hated: they c Pag. 90 deny not the second, that he was made the proper punishment or Sacrifice for our sinne.

And thus though you lust not to see it, yet my^d speech was sound d Treat. pag. 45 and true, If Christ dyed simply but as the Godly dye, it might in no sort^e heere be called a Curse. The reason is evident; because the text heere doeth speak & treat of the Curse of the Law against sinne: such therefore was Christes Curse which he sustayned. To conclude then, his afflictions and death was neither *Wages* nor *Chastisement*, nor *Curse* nor *Consequent* of any sinne in him. Yet as God made him *sinne for vs*, so he truly, properly, and in very deed, laid the paine of his Curse vpon his body and Soule. Which Curse of God vpon Christ (as you^f say truly) f Pag. 90 was not in words but g Pag. 90 in deedes. Wherefore my wordes & you openly pervert, affirming g Pag. 90 that I say, Death heere (that is Christes death, noted Galat. 3. 13.) may in no sorte be called a Curse, when I expressly even there, and

Pag. 163.

Pag. 164.

Treat. 1.

pag. 40.

Pag. 190.

Treat. 1.

pag. 81.

Pag. 26.

Pag. 37.

Also Pa. 23.

Treat. Pa. 23.

Newell.

Catechif.

See before

pag. 8.

The. 5. 22.

pa. 48. 51.

Pag. 11. 12.

and 16. 17.

Pa. 272. 280.

Before

31. 11.

every where doe say the contrary. But ^a your greatest exception is, that this Curse laid on Christ cannot be vnderstood of the whole Curse of God or of the Law: and therefore ^b you spare me not for ^c saying that Paul heere in his application out of Moses nameth a part of the iust Curse of the Law for sinne, thereby meaning (and inferring to his purpose) the whole. Where you must be so good as to vnderstand me by mine own words in other places. For thus ^d you know ^e I limited my speech els where, *As touching the vehemency of paine Christ was as sharply touched as the very reprobate. And, Christes sufferings were equall to the very Hellish torments in vehemency of paine and sharpnes. Againe, ^f This price equally in Justice must be kept so far as it is possible. And, ^g Because there was no impossibility, no necessity, no reason, but he might feele the full smart of our sinnes, (as there was that he should not feele the full continuance thereof) and seeing Gods strict iustice requireth it to be so, therefore it was so, he suffered all the smart, but not all the continuance of our punishment.* Thus then plainly ^h I signified ⁱ those ^j Limitations which now are expressed, that Christ suffered our whole Curse only so far as the possibilitie of things could admit, wherein nothing was dispensed nor pardoned to him (for there was no cause) as I have often said. Which doctrine how vnworthy it is of your strange contempt and outcries against me, I leave it to the godly Wise to consider. Only marke if our ^k publike doctrine be not the same. *Vltima omnia pati voluit pro nobis, qui vltima omnia commisit famus. Diram execratione suscepit: contumelias etiam omnes, omnia probra, atque supplicia: &c.* But you will say, thus we make it not the whole Curse of the Law. Yes: we call it rightly the whole Curse, for as much as Christ suffered it in his whole manhood, even in ^l All the powers of his ^m Spirit, & Soule, & Body. Where that Curse in *Dextero*. being a part, was suffered only in the Body quickned by the Soule. Also in other respects this suffering of Christ may bee well called the whole Curse or Punishment of sin, as ⁿ before is declared. After this ^o you thinke it strange that I say, Christ suffered & dyed iustly, and was hanged on the tree by the iust sentence of the Law: & that so bee was by imputation of our state and condition vnto him, sinfull, defiled, hatefull, and accursed. All the which I avouch, because he vnderooke by Gods ordinance as our Surety to receive our whole condemnation vpon himselfe so far as his owne nature

and condition could possibly admit, to the ende that hee might wholly acquit vs. In regard whereof I aske, *Is it wrong for the Law to lay the penalty on the surety, when the debtour can not discharge it?* Against this my assertion you say, *a By no sentence of the Law he hanged on a tree.* And a reason you give, *b because to be hanged on a tree was no necessary part of the generall Curse of God upon all sinners.* I answer, to Dy for sinne was a necessary part of the generall Curse upon all sinners. What say you then to his Death? Did he dy *justly*? Sure if Christ dyed by the rule of Gods iustice, then he dyed *justly*. If he dyed not by Gods iustice, then Wo, and thrice Wo to vs. For it cannot be but Gods Iustice^a must be executed: it cannot be made voyd. So that if Christ in Gods proper iustice dyed not for vs, then in his Iustice without mercy we must, and shall dy. Which God forbid. But Christ therefore indeed suffered & dyed most *justly*, according to the rule of Gods strict Iustice in all points possible. Yet you say, *His hanging on a tree was no necessary part of the generall Curse of God upon all sinners.* What if that were no necessary part of the generall Curse? It was nevertheless *just* from God vpon him, as well as his Death. No particular Punishments are necessary, but accidentall in their own nature. The generall Curse^c *Thou shalt dy the Death*, comprehending them all not as necessary, but as accidentall parts. Yet wheresoever by Gods providence they happen, they are *just* Punishments, no lesse then the Generall Curse. And thus Christ answering for sinne not only Dyed generally, but also was hanged on the tree particularly by the *just* sentence of the Law. Still I meane *justly* in respect of God alone: for men vsed meere violence, wrong, and no Law towards him. For they persecuted him as a malefactor (as they said) yet indeed hee being in himselfe altogether faultles and without blame. You seeme to mislike that Christ should suffer *justly*, because he suffered *willingly* for vs. Which hindereth not at all: for the voluntary surety beareth his penaltie *justly*, when he sustayneth that which the debtour by Law should sustaine. You say *d No Lawe*, *you are sure not Gods Law*, alloweth that when a murderer or such like offendour transgresseth he should be spared, and an other that is willing hanged in his stead. And therefore you mislike the similitude of a Surety in the worke of Christes Redemption. I answered in Gods Law that is not true, which you say. Vnderstanding heere

Christ suffer-
justly.

a Pag. 172.

b Pag. 173.

* Luc. 16. 26.
Dent. 19. 17.
Rom. 2. 13.
See before
pag. 46.

c Gen. 2. 17.

d Pag. 174.

Pag. 280.

Ezec. 18. 20

Gen. 18. 25.

Rom 8. 3.

Syriac.

bekefrob.

2. Cor. 5. 21.

Gal. 3. 13.

Though you

may: p. 280.

Calv in Gal.

. 13.

Heb. 9. vlt.

Pag. 11. 12.

ed. 50. 51.

Pag. 280.

2. Cor. 5. 21

Cyp. de

Act.

by Gods revealed Will and his most holy and gracious Ordinance for vs. Though indeed this is not his Law properly, but his Gospel, & the most blessed glad tydings of peace and health to our Soules. Now by this Law of God I am sure, that Murderers, Adulterers, Theeves (and worse then these) are spared in Gods presence, and another that is their most willing surety executed by the iustice of God in their stead. But ^a no similitude can prove Christ in taking ~~our~~ person on him to be sinfull, defiled, hatefull, and accursed. I deny this saying utterly. ^b How could he be by God properly and truly punished and Cursed for sinne, but that he was sinfull and hatefull: And it is written, ^a God sent his Sonne in the likenes and forme of sinfull flesh for sinne, and condemned sinne in ^d (his) flesh. In which likenes he stood before God indeed: before the world he was reputed so, but falsly. And ^e God made him sinne for vs that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. As also he was made ^f a Curse for vs. Whereupon Mr Calvin & warily enough saith, ^g *Personam nostram suscepit, peccator erat & maledictionis reus.* And ^h ⁱ Apostle saith, *Ek deuterou The second time he shall appeare without sinne:* meaning that the first time he appeared with sin. Yet this is ^k not inherently, but by imputation: the Lorde translating by his ordinance the sinne of men vpon him, & reckoning them ynto him. Even as by Gods true and reall imputation, not by any inhætion we now in this life are iust holy and blameles before God: so was he sinnefull and defiled by imputation, not inherently. Thus by this reckoning he suffered at Gods hands iustly: yet in his own nature, & in respect meereley thereof, he suffered both at the Iewes handes and before God *the iust for the vniust.* ^l You say, where the Apostle saith ^m *he was made sin for vs*; the Fathers have a good and approved senses differing fro ours. ⁿ 1 That God made him a sacrifice for sinne: ^o 2 that he vsed him as he doth sinners. What is there in both these that wee acknowledge not? Yea what is this later but the very same point which we vrge? It is nothing els in all this question that we hold, but that God vsed Christ our Redeemer and Surety as he doth sinners, so far as possibilitie admitteth that he could and might be so vsed. And for this the Fathers are not silent, if I were so ambitious as you in producing multitudes of men. Only Cyprian, and Athanasius, and Augustine shall content me in this. The first, ^p *He sustayned & suffered*

selfe to be called Sinne and a Curse by *Moses* and the *Apostle*, be-
 cause he had the like punishment as we should have had, but not the
 like fault. * Your slight answer that it was like in part, not in all,
 salueth not the matter. For Cyprian meaneth Christs punishment
 for vs was so like ours, as was possible: and that sufficeth vs. Also
 by this your weake answer you are contrary to your selfe heere, in
 that you acknowledge that God in punishing Christ making him
 sinne for vs, *hee vsed him as he doth sinners*. Athanasius saith, *Ipsē*
per se sententiam soluit sub specie condemnati: Hec himselfe satisfied
and abrogated the sentence of the Law under the appearance of a
Damned man. Did not God then vse him as he doth sinners in all
 extremity of punishment so far as was possible? And that it was al-
 together possible to inflict the sense of his wrath immediatly and
 properly in his Soul, as wel as in his Body, no reasonable man eade-
 nly. Aust. we saw a little ^b before. Thus also your former good sense
 of this that *Christ was made sinne*, that is a sacrifice or punishment
 for sinne: how differeth it from your second, as you seeme to make
 them to differ? Or how differ they both from our maine Assertion,
 that Christ in himselfe sinlesse, was by God reputed sinfull in our
 stead. Nay this directly and necessarily proveth the same. For as I
 said, how could he be truly punished for sinne by God, but that he
 must be indeede sinfull by imputation? The Iewes Sacrifices the
 expresse figures of Christe doe also most lively set out this thing.
 When they were ^c brought vnto God, the people must lay on their
 hands vpon the heads of the Beastes: shewing thereby that their
 sinnes were put vpon the sacrifice, & that God so accounted them
 indeed to be. Wherefore what cause have you so to exclaime as you
 do, against this comparison of Christ our Redeemer with a Surety:
 who among men by the ordinance of Lawe and iustice must and
 doth pay the debt when the debtour cannot. It is neither a *simple*
similitude as ^e you simply call it: neither is it *uncleane*, nor *irreue-*
rent, nor *irreligious*, but a holy & most fit representation of Christs
 paying our debt for vs, and of our acquitting from the iustice of
 God by him. The very word is vsed in Scripture it selfe, *Hee was*
made a Surety of a better covenant. Which also expressly you grant:
That Christe is made a Surety wee finde is once mentioned in the
Scripture. Is not that sufficient then to warrant the goodnesse and
 aptnes of the *similitude* against your vndutyfull reprooses of it?

But you say he was not as a Surety bound to the Law, but of a better
 Covenant, even of grace. Verily a Surety to vs, of both. Yea this lar-
 ter implyeth necessarily the former, vnles you imagine Gods ius-
 tice needed not exact satisfaction so far as was possible: or that
 there might be 2 Sureties to bring vs into grace and fauour with
 God. For he could not assure vs of remission of sinnes, but by assu-
 ring vs that he had exactly paid all our debts. Yea none could pay
 them for vs thoroughly & acquit himself also, but only he. There-
 fore by being a Surety to vs of grace, it must needs bee also that
 he, and none other, was our Surety to the Law and to the iustice of
 God. Thus also it is written that ^a He was made *hypowomen* sub-
 iect to the Law, or vnder the Law. Which ^b you mightily deny a-
 gainst expresse Scripture. But by what reason? Because he was a
 Mediatour to God for vs. Now Sureties that stand bound & must
 pay the debt, may not looke to be Mediatours. Yes forsooth, such
 a Surety as he was might worthily be a gracious Mediatour also.
 Though he were a Surety, and stood bound, yet he was no ordina-
 ry Surety. Though the debt were infinit, yet hee was more infinit
 in grace and power both to pay it, and to overcome it: and by his
 obedience and righteousness to merit for vs, yea even in his suffe-
 ring. What letteth then that such a person as he, might be a Me-
 diatour to purchase also grace and fauour, even in and besides his
 satisfaction for vs. ^c You say, he could not be bound to the Law, be-
 cause he was above the Law. He was above the Lawe in his God-
 head, but in his Manhood hee became for vs ^d vnder the Law.
 Again, he was not of him self in his Manhood bound to the Law
 for vs, but freely and voluntarily vndertaking, and by Gods gra-
 cious eternall Decree appointing him, so he became bound to the
 Law. Wherefore, though he, who ordinarily redeemeth a priso-
 ner from the enemy, be not bound, but content so to doe: yet a
 Suretie being content, becommeth bound. And so Christ our Re-
 deemer became bound as a Surety to pay our debt for vs by the
 most stedfast and immutable Decree of God, and yet also by his
 owne most free good will, Yea Gods Decree, and his owne good
 will was, that he should satisfie and pay none otherwise for vs,
 then so as hee did: Therefore those Sentences of your Au-
 thours *Gregorie, Augustin and Ambrose*, if they bee spoken
 simply, seeme very harsh, where they saye, *That Christ could*
have

have saved us otherwayes, then by suffering and dying for us. For heerein they oppose Gods absolut Omnipotencie against his expresse and revealed will. Which how it may be liked in Divinitie, I know not. Wherefore still all these similitudes of Mediator, Redeemer, and Suretie, may stand very well together in the Office of Christ, though you would perswade vs the contrary, yea rather they confirme each other. Certainly, these Similitudes of a Suretie and a Mediatour, are very approved & excellent to set out moit heavenly his great Grace and Iustice, by earthly things. Our publike Churches doctrine also avoucheth that hee was ^b our Suretie. With Christ, as our Suretie, so suffering, God deals as it were in extremitie of Law, &c. Also Cyprian, ^c In saying, why hast thou forsaken me, he sheweth the sorrow of that his complaining to be the wordes, Delictorum suorum, or Delictorum suorum, of his sinnes: or if you so thinke rather, of his beloved ones, whose person & case he took upon him. And this he would have us to know that, it was for them, or in their stead, who by reason of their sinnes deserved to be forsaken of God. You ^d answer that these wordes of Cyprian, I neither understand nor like. I pray why so? Because Augustin saith, *illa vox membrorum erat non capitis*, That Cry was of his Members, not of the Head. Whatsoever Augustins meaning is here-in, yet Cyprians wordes are plaine and can not beare any other sense then as I make of them, that Christ was a very Surety for his people, and suffered such a forsaking of God touching sense of paine and want of present feeling of comfort in the paines, as the damned dog. And touching Augustin also, I suppose you mis-understand him: but of his minde touching this speech of Christ on the Crosse, we shall see further hereafter. I adde vnto all this, last of all your owne grant, where you fully yeeld and acknowledge that Christ was our very Suretie to the Law, and that he did suffer iustly, or in Gods iustice. The vengeance of the Law (say you) once executed on our Suretie, can no more in Gods iustice be executed on vs. Elsewhere also you allow of this similitude: which yet sometime you reiect most disdainfully. Yea in that your sentence you overthrow your owne thicke exception which you make against it, that he was not our Surety to the Law to pay our debts. If the vengeance of the Law, lighted on him as on a Suretie; then he was our Suretie to the Law: and if this vengeance of the Law

a Pag. 57

b Nowell
techi
fore pag
c Cypri
passim

d Pag. 57

e Pag. 57

f Pag. 57

276.

277.

g Pag. 57

not now in Gods iustice be exacted on vs, then he as our Suretie to
 the Law by suffering it hath cleered vs from it. And to conclude,
 that which he suffered as being our Suretie, the same before God
 he suffered in iustice, as is before proved. And in vaine you ex-
 claime, that this is ^aagainst the Scriptures, against the faith, against
 the Fathers, against the Consciences of Gods people: seeing it ap-
 peareth not to be against, but with all these. ^bYour Similitude of
 a Kings sonne intreating for his Fathers Rebels, is very weake, and
 overthroweth (if it were good) a confessed point of Christes Re-
 demption. For by this similitude Christ should not have suffered
 bodily death for vs: seeing no King hath lawfull power by any
 meanes to lay bodily death on any such Surety, much lesse to
 make his Sonne, or his Sonne to make him selfe any such Suretie
 or Redeemer of Rebels: as Christ was made and might be made
 of God for vs: So that also where you would have it to serve, that
 we might perceave by this how Christ was not defiled, nor hatefull,
 nor guilty by imputation of our treason, it is evidently to weak. For
 you have not shewed, neither can shew, that this Kings Sonne was
 or ought to have bene such a Suretie & Redeemer as Christ was,
 that is unto bodily death. Therefore this Similitude cannot be
 good. We have other maner of warrant that Christ was by im-
 putation made Sinne for vs, and the Curse for vs: and that this ordi-
 nance was holy and right, and above all reproofe. Which you can
 not bring for your Kings Sones Suretiship, nor for the Kings faith:
 who kept not the order of iustice when he spared abominable Re-
 bells without their blood shed, or when he slew his guiltles Sones
 for them, that they might be spared.

After this ^ahe impugneth another reason of myne with mar-
 veylous skorne and detestation. That seeing Christ ^aon the Crosse
 spoyle principalities and powers, and made a shew of them open-
 ly triumphing over them, Therefore I collected, that Christ there
 discerned and felt the Powers of darknes (Sathan and his Com-
 plices) as very instrumentes working the effectes of Gods wrath
 upon him selfe. Which as I conceave, is no such foolish nor im-
 pious reason as he vainly pretendeth. For doth not the very phrase
 and maner of speach import some such mightie contention and
 violent opposition, where yet at length an absolute & glorious
 triumph was obtained? Surely it doeth. This then

tempted by Satans inward suggestion, but onely by the eare receiving an outward voyce: This I suppose also is a singular conceit of your owne without any title of Scripture to proove it by. Yea what reason can you give that where the minde conceiveth any temptation, there of necessity must be Concupiscence, Originall sinne, Corruption of the flesh, &c. *In vs men it is so*, you say. I grant *in vs* it is so. But that of necessity in nature it must be so, as that *Adam* was tempted by voyce of necessity, and not accidentally; I see no reason in the world: or that Christ might not be sometime inwardly assaulted & tempted also without hearing any voyce. Nay I suppose you have no reason to affirme (as you doe) that Christ in the Wildernes was tempted by *outward voyce only*. It seemeth rather to be manifest that his temptation was meere in cogitation and in the thoughts of his heart so mooved by the spirituall suggestion of the Diuell. First, because the text saith, that Satan *set him upon a pinnacle of the temple in Ierusalem*, and mooved him to *cast him selfe downe*. Which was within the time of his fasting, and hee fasted but forty dayes and forty nights: and so long continually hee was in the wildernes. Seeing then Christ was in the Wildernes all the while that hee was thus tempted, Howe could that bee really and actually done? This was therefore in a spirituall Cogitation. But chiefe, when the *Diuell shewed him all the kingdomes of the worlde and the glorie of them*, and *that in the twinkling of an eye*, how could that possibly be done really, actually, and externally? Wherefore I must needs think that as Satan was a subtil Spirit, so he could & did sometime spirituallly suggest temptations into Christes heart, and Christ could in Soule conceave them, and yet viterly without all sin: which we at no hand now can doe, because we are all naturally apt and inclining to evill, as Christ was not. Yea the text to the *Hebr.* seemeth to prove it also, *Christ was tempted in all things like vs, without sinne*. Then he was tempted both outwardly and also meere within: (for so are we) and this was meere by conceaving and considering of Satans wicked spirituall motion in his Spirit, which it was possible that he might doe without any yielding to it, though we by reason of our inborne corruptio can not possibly doe it. This then it was possible, and most likely, *it is also* that Christ was assaulted, and *wastled* within by the Devils

a Pag. 10

b Pag. 10

* Cords by
such things
objects to
ther, w
work the
rituall co
tion in C
As Saith
well kno
how.

c Mat.

d Mar.

e Mat.

f Luc.

† Yes.

sibly is

be don

ally &c

sacred

yon. But

onles is

be. Ergo

sp.

A DISCOURSE OF THE

24

Spiritual suggestions now when in most bitter Agonie he hangd
on the Crosse. Howbeit to goe further, such grievous and bitter
assaultes of the Divil he might receave outwardly also by his sen-
sualties otherwayes: though not by Satans own voyce, yet by Satans
members meanes. And so you say he was tempted of Satan *all*
the tyme of his abode on earth. Then so you denie not, but now e-
ven on the Crosse Christ might be and was tempted and assaulted
by Satan, that is by Satans instrumentes, moved and enraged by
him. And this is none other indeed, but that which in the entyce
of this question heere I observed: which as I have before shewed
sufficeth to prove Christes *Combating*, as it were, and *wrestling*
with the powers of Hell on the Crosse. But you object against
this, that *Outward temptation by the mouthes and handes of the*
wicked, is no effect of Gods wrath. No is? Here you are cleane con-
trary to your self and the truth. Elsewhere you truly acknowledge
that all outward crosse and afflictions *small or great* are in their
nature punishments of sin and effects of Gods wrath. Now those
doubles are temptations. Then sure these outward temptations
by the mouthes and handes of the wicked such as Christ endured,
are effects of Gods wrath, viz. his revilings, his shame, his poverty,
his stripes, his woundes, and death it selfe, &c. You say outward
temptation is rather a tryall of Gods gifts and graces bestowed upon
us. And is not inward temptation in the Godly so to? I pray what
oddes is this, that you make betweene the inward and outward
temptations? It is true, this is one good yse of both these sortes in
the godly, in whom Christ hath sanctified all afflictions, & death
it selfe. Yet in their very nature they all are none other but paines
of Gods Curse for sin, very punishments of sinne, and true effects
of Gods wrath: as in Christ they were all. Further Satan might
spiritually and extraordinarily worke together with these his in-
struments outwardly afflicting his body, I say, by these bodily oc-
casions thus the rather working an impression of his malice and
spiritual fury mixed with subtilty against Christ: and Christ like-
wise extraordinarily might apprehend the same, that is the rather
by the concurrence and cooperation of those outward occasions
with these spiritual incursions. And thus might Christ suffer
strange temptations, and incomprehensible sorrows, as many
punishments of sinne from the furious rage of Satan and
of wicked men, whatsoever other viles they might have befallen

TREATISE ON CHAIST'S SUFFERINGS.

him. I perswade you may see how naturally you conclude that Sa-
tan could no other way punish Christ as an instrument of Gods
wrath, but only by exercising torments on his Soule: even in such
wise as he tormenteth damned soules in Hell: and that can be, say you,
no other way then by Satans very possessing of chiefe soules: Which
grosse and infernall speculations of yours (for truths you can
not make them) I utterly leave to your owne discussing. For my
parte I have spoken no word of them in all my treatise. Notwith-
standing this heere I avouch, that howsoever the meanes or ma-
ner was of Satans and his furious bandes assaulting of Christ on
the Crosse, it made certainly an impression of most doleful sorrow
and torment in his Soule, as feeling be deserting by that meanes
the very stroke of Gods owne hand upon him, and receiving the
sling of his wrath and indignation therein, which then wrought,
and was revealed chiefly then vpon him for all our sinnes. Neither
say you any thing whereby you doe or can overthrow this asser-
tion. Our authorised doctrine in England agreeth with me, saying,
He fought and wrestled as it were hand to hand with the whole
army of Hell. Finally heere where you scornfully reject and de-
test this my sense of the Apostle in this place, yet you give no ink-
ling of any other sense at all which these wordes might seeme ra-
ther to admit. Wherefore this is more then halfe a conclusion a-
gainst you, that my interpretation and application of it is vniustly
by you reproveth.

Then you come to confute my fourth Reason: but the mainest
points thereof you have not so much as touched: I shewed that
the Godly sometimes in this life doe feeble a taste of Gods infinit
Wrath, and even of Hellish sorrowes. 1. That Christ our Redee-
mer suffered for vs as deeply, yea deeper then ever any of vs heere
do suffer or can suffer. But all this you can heere cleanly passe over
without any worde to it. Wherevpon it followeth soundly, that
Christ indeed suffered in Spirit the true effects of Gods wrath, and
even the sense of Hellish sorrowes. Howbeit in an other reason of
mine not vnlke to that, you thinke you can picke more advan-
tage against some wordes. I shewed out of the Hebrew that Christ
suffered as we do but without the experience of our inward
and infernall. Now he sayeth that we are in the filling of the
wrath of God and sorrow of Hell in our Soules. I thought he meant

2. 22. 29.

a The
wrestling
struggle
may be
such as
occured in
local Hell

b Now
Cathol

a Pag

b Trans
p. 41

22. 29.

had experience of the same, I mean, always so far as was possible
 that is in the nature of the thing, & pain thereof, no further.
 Where note that the words of this Proposition are not only white
 more generall, neither include they any thing lesse tolerable then
 the sent it selfe doth, thus, Wherefore in all things it behooved him
 (or he ought) to be made like unto his brethren. Aske in temptations,
 infirmities, and afflictions, only excepting that he might be a man
 of full and faithfull high spirit in things concerning God. But in that
 which himselfe suffered and was tempted (in) he is able to succour
 them which are tempted. First, en he in that which himselfe suffered,
 1. significantly either the manner wherein Christ is able to succour vs, or
 2. the means whereby he is cometh able, that is to say, ready and
 3. fit to succour vs, or else the occasion and reason why he is the rea-
 dy to succour vs, even in that himselfe suffered and was it tempted.
 he is able to succour them who are tempted. As if hee should say,
 were it not that himselfe by his owne feeling knew the misery of
 our sufferings and temptations, he had not ben so ready to succour
 vs in all our, not with such compassion, as now he is. Which way
 soever of these; we take these words, yet they plainly inferre that
 Christ himselfe felt all the misery and smart of our sufferings and
 temptations which we at any time do feele, & wherein we are
 coursed. Thus as I have shewed (neither do you gain say) The godly
 sometimes feeling an infinit paine of Gods wrath and of Hellish
 sorrows in this life: Christ therefore felt the same indeed to succour
 vs thereby. Whereunto serveth our publique doctrine, & Divinity
 crationem quasi celera nos nostra devotum at in se suscepit et non
 hoc pacto exolveret. Albeit heere the first way seemeth to import
 the unlikelyest, that the Apostle should signifie, All the manner
 meely that kind of paine wherein he succoureth vs, even that which
 himselfe also had experience of. And this all those words
 paine in all things do fully import. But indeed all; are but one
 & the same in effect as I said. So we must note that in these words
 Christ was like vs in all temptations and afflictions, we are to
 understand, All that are incident to Mankind generally; not which
 happen to any man particularly. All the particular crosses in the
 world, neither could nor can possibly come to any man. Also
 he suffered not only in one or in some parts of our nature, but
 all and every part, even in Spirit and Soule and Body, like unto

Which also
ough All ge-
ally feel
e, yet gene-
ly it is due
All in re-
st of finne.

pag. 29.
Cyrill. The-
sa. 10. 3.

Humane
nature.

eternall kinde of paine that him selfe had experience of. But he shew
counsell us in the feeling of the torments of God, he releaseth us of
the paines and sorrowe of vniuersall sinners. There first
him selfe had experience of them. This same also sundry of the Pa-
thers touch with vs most fully: and even those which your selfe
brings for your selfe. Cyrills wordes before touched are most
large, O Maria Christus perpassus es, et nos ab omnibus liberasti
Christ throughly suffered all such passions, which men doe suffer
that he might deliver us from all. All the passions of a flesh were
suffered by Christ, yet without sinne, and so that vntill he had dyed he
had not bene delivered from death, vntill he had feared and sorrowed
and we had not ben quitted from feare and sorrowe. Heere he saith, all
our passions were stirred in Christs humane nature, even so farre
as we are cured, and so farre as might be without sinne in time.
Thou I hope by Cyrills iudgement the sense of the true end and
proper wrath of God for sinne was in Christs soules, so farre as it
might be painfull and not sinfull feeling. Men are subiect to this
suffering as the most sharpest among others. Lastly by Cyrill here
we see that vntill Christ had felt the same sufferings which we feel
and are cured of, we had not bene delivered of them. This also
assureth us of your opinion. That the love of Christ is
was sufficient for our whole redemption, which was one of your
principles in your preaching, but in your booke you skip it cleane
know not how. Next we may see that your place of suffering
also fully to the same effect. A little after his former words he saith
The joy of the new birth is Goddome being purged away from sinne.
That affected with the indignities of our infirmity. He saith againe
my sorrowe: that he might free me out of my, and by a briefe death
the sorrow of death in our manner, that by his same nature he
might bring us to life. He ought therfore to be sorrowed that he
overcame sorrowe, and not to escape himselfe from it, or that we
let us on our brethren in the sorrow of death, and so forth.
fore Christ exempted himselfe from nothing in his Passion, that
we have experience of as touching paines and sorrowe. And
the same suffering in himselfe for vs, he healeth vs, whereunto
and subiect by reason of sinne. So that thus (as his good will
throughout such a desperate state, that he took on his flesh, he
sinne, leaving us a life free from the sorrow of death, and so forth.

pag. 29.

pag. 26.

Luc. de
de dol.

fore pa. 48

of our Soules. To this very purpose also many others before rehearsed do affirme most fully. Neither is this taking of their sentences any whit to abuse the Fathers, w^{ch} you are afraid of. You greatly abuse them which take them otherwise: namely as if they meant that by the flesh and bloodshed of Christ meerey & alone without the merit of his Soules and Minder proper suffering, our whole Ransom were paid. As for our comparing the paines of Christs suffering with the paines even of the Reprobats in this life, I see not that you nor any man living can finde fault therewith: onely set aside their sinfull suffering, which alwayes I testifie that Christ was most free from. Yea I doubt not but we may compare Christs sufferings in his Agonies *touching vehemency of paines* even with those of the Damned in hell. Only I conceive betweene Christs, and theirs this odds: 1 They suffer sinfully, 2 Perpetually, 3 Locally in Hell. All which being excepted, otherwise Christ suffered altogether as bitterly & as sharply (yea I may say in nature the very same) as the Damned doe: which therefore may well be called *the paines of Hell*, although yet Hell indeed doeth differ in some great and waighty circumstances, as is aforesaid. If you say, the extreamest paines of punishment cannot be where sinne is not. That is true: neither in deed can the least paines be where there is no sinne: and that no more in the Body then in the Soule, though this please not you. Marke what I say, The extreamest paines of all may as possibly be inflicted where no sinne is, as the very least, & that as well in the Spirit as in the Body. But in truth neither the one nor the other is possible. Neither the greatest nor the least paines of Gods proper vengeance for sinne can be inflicted or suffered in all in Soule or in Body, but only where sinne is. That is to say, either imputed or inherent. Ordinarily the Reprobats are thus punished, where sinne is inherent. Extraordinarily and singularly by Gods owne Ipeccall ordinance Christ was even thus punished, yet where sin was but imputed. And thus therefore Christs Soule for meere paine might suffer the extreamest spiritual punishments (yea rather as well as his body might suffer any at all) without inherent sinne. But you graunt his body suffered truly punishment for sinne. Therefore his soule might suffer also, even those of the extreamest degree. You selfe also graunt that Christ both might and did suffer the extreamest paines that might bee,

a Pag. 47.
Nazian.
Fulgen.
Bernard.
Tertull.
Ierom.
b Pag. 46.

What the
is between
Christs
suffering &
Damned.

a Pag. 47.
b Pag. 46.

without his owne sinne. But it was possible for him to conceiue
and feele in his minde farre greater sorrowes and paines for our
sinne from Gods wrath, then hee could feele merely in his body
outwardly. And the greatest was no more sinne then the least
though both were properly for sin. Therefore by your owne grant
Christ might and did feele and indure the greatest sorrowes of the
minde and soule as well as the lesser in the body, being all the very
effectes of the wrath of God against sinne. You bring a reason
against this, that God spiritually punisheth no man but for his owne
vncleannes; which is a thing merely vntime. For though no o-
ther man was ever punished without his owne vncleannes, neither
spiritually nor corporally, yet Christ our Saviour was: who in this
case was not in the ordinarie state of men. But I pray shewe me
this mysterie how it is that God cannot punish Spiritually where there
is no inherent sinne, but can and may Corporally where there is none.
All the rest of your assertions & heere are altogether of this sorte.
By this one reason I weakened all yours, but you could passe that
by, answering ynto it not a word. Viz. If Christs body hanging
on the Crosse, and held by Death in the grave, was punished by
God where yet he found no sinne and which he still sorierly loved
and was never separated fro, then so hee might & did punish pro-
perly his Soule also, & yet never diuide his Godhead nor his love
from it. But thus hee did to his body: therefore even so hee might
doe, and did to his soule properly also. For the one standeth with
Gods iustice, and with the Nature of man in Christ, as well as the
other. So farre for this.

pag. 103.

Then you addresse your selfe against another, even one of the
chiefest reasons of mine, which I make from the strange and
comparable Agony of Christ in the tyme of his Passion. These
invaded him, as we read, principally at 4. times: 1. in the forefront
of his Passion, shewed vs in the 12. of Iohn. 2. In the Garden a houre
before his apprehension. 3. In his very extreame Passion as hee
on the Crosse. The Scriptures heretofore I rehearsed at full
lengthence these piteous and unspeakable agonies of his are now
hed vnto vs, whereby to all (that duly consider) it appeareth
clear as the Sonne at noone day, that The paines of his Passion
which plainly may be felt, and feared, (because he knew he must
feele them further vnto death) were the greater and direst cause

TREATISE OF CHRISTI SUFFERINGS.

those Agonies. But we assume, that such strange and lamentable things and behaviour in Christ were not the effects only and consequence of his bodily paines and death, or of the state of them. Therefore Christ felt and endured more then his mere bodily paine and death, by the testimonie of the Scriptures, which thing you deny. In your whole discourse you gainsay the Proposition, that the paines of Christes Passion, or the naturall fears of them, was the proper and direct cause of those Agonies: or that these Scriptures doe imply so much. The Assumption you graunt and acknowledge, that the mere bodily paines and death of Christ or the fears thereof, were not the only, nor the proper and direct Cause of these Agonies in him. For you are resolved that the cause of Christes Agonies could not proceede but from his Submission to God or Compassion to men, or both. These you name elsewhere a religious Feare, Devotion and Pietie to God, pietie to man, &c. And thus you resolutely denie my Proposition. For you meane it seemeth that Christ suffered paines in his Soule by reason of the strength and zeale of these his Holy Affections: and that these were the proper and maine Causes of that his most wofull and miraculous Agonie & Complaint. Therefore not any extraordinarie Paines inflicted vpon him by way of proper punishment, as my Proposition intendeth. But this your Assertion I simply denie, that Christes Holy Affections, his Piety and his Pity were the proper and maine Causes of that his most wofull and miraculous Agonie & Complaint. And then my Proposition standeth firme, that his Paines inflicted on him by way of proper Punishment and Vengeance for sinne were the proper and direct Cause thereof. Wherefore let vs try your proofes for it, and then mine against it. But before we come to them, you must know that this your Resolution, as you call it, is first most vaine, also directly contrary to your selfe, and then altogether untrue and preiudiciall by wide coniecture; as God willing presently I shall shew. For the first, I humbly intreat the Christian Reader to marke well & consider, how your L. doth contrive 3. notable Equivocations in these few wordes, Christ suffered in his Soule the wrath of God. As you seeme to grant, but in truth you do not; and if we ad also allow it to be so, then wee begin with a fourth instance against it. For these 3. or 4. are the only Pillars of his Doctrin. For the first, your first Equivocation is in this word Christ suffered:

And

and

a Before
14. 25. 30.
b Pag. 17.
22. 23. 29.
34. 35.

b Pag. 190.

c Pag. 19. 1
d Pag. 124.
20, 21.

Notable So-
phistic.

A DIVERSE OF THE

and about it wee deale in this place now. The common and usu-
 ary phrase of men vnderstandeth heerein, *His suffering of paines*
 inflicted on him by way of proper punishment and satisfaction for
 sinne, which he undertooke for vs. Only this in the ordinarie and
 usuall manner of speech is signified by Christes suffering or his Pas-
 sion: and so doe we alwayes vnderstand by it. But you cunningly
 take another rare sense of this word, as it signifieth the *Afflictions*
 of the *Minde* in Christ wholly bent to Holines, Righteousnes,
 & Obedience of God: that so he might exactly & perfectly keep his
 iust Law. Which 2. partes of Christes Mediation are greatly dis-
 tinction, and ought not both in truth to be called His Passion or Sa-
 tisfaction for sinne. Therefore speake plainly I beseech you, and
 deceave vs not: call not this His Soules suffering, but his Soules
 Holines & Righteousnes. And seeing you meane, This was the pro-
 per & maine cause of Christes Passion & Suffering wher he wrought
 his satisfaction for sin now at the last end of his life chiefly, I ad-
 denie it: all Reason reclaimeth against it: and to that which I ad-
 leage for further reproofe thereof, you answer nothing. Your
 next Equivocation is in this, Hee suffered *in Soules*: your next in
 Gods wrath, both which I have plainly shewed before. As also
 your 4. Fallacy, which may be called *Fallacia Accidentis*. But
 I hope you will not thinke to beate downe all afore you with
 thing but with cunning yet vaine deceipt countenanced out with
 cruell and hatefull wordes. Further, you are in this your *Resolution*
 directly contrary to your owne selfe: as I before I have shewed
 sufficiently shewed. Againe, where you censure your selfe
 sharply for your resolution in this cause, *It is contrary to reason*
 presumption to determine impossibility to conclude certainly
 was the true cause thereof. Thirdly, where you make but a
 submission to God, *Compulsion to men*, elsewhere but one
 fear. But before you very precisely made & if you agree
 with your selfe I have full hope that you will agree with
 al this your resolution, making Christes Passion to be the
 proper & maine Cause of all his workes & actions. But before
 vaine, having no ground but meer consequence. But before
 my reasons against your Affliction, let vs first consider
 Causes & let any one of the causes be
 sufficient to the Affliction of God suffering in his

that Christes
 suffering or
 passion is pro-
 perly.

before pa.
 52. 64.

Text. 1.
 pag. 61. 69.

See before
 pag. 52.

Before pa.
 19.

Before pag.
 66. 58.

Before pa.
 64.

Pag. 17.

Pag. 190.

Pag. 13.
 Pa. 17. 82.

Pag. 18.

In what cause late he now in iudgement, when Christ was thus af-
flicted & Agonized there with. Of necessity it must be one of these
three wayes. 1. Gods Majesty & great iustice now at this time might
forth iudgement against vs & so consequently yea chiefly against
Christ him selfe as our Ransom-payer and Surety in our stead. If
you meane, that thus Christ with Submitting beholding his Father
in iudgement at this time was cast into this Agonie, it is the verie
truth, and the same that we maintaine. For this denyeth not, but
that he had real paines inflicted fro the Father as from a iust iudge
against vs in him, who were thus acquitted by him. And thus if
Ans. and others sentences be vnderstood, that the Complaint on
the Crosse was not Christs in respect of him selfe but in respect of
his Church for whom then & there he answered before God com-
ming now to execute iudgements for their sakes, so they be well &
rightly vnderstood: otherwise there is no truth in them, namely
as you seeme to vse them. Second: God might be considered now
as iudging Satan the prince of this world, and overcoming him
for vs by the victorie of Christes sufferings which he was now a-
bout to vndergoe: that thus the Diuell (as you note out of *Au-*
stin) might be vanquished in our Cause not by Gods absolute and
mere power, but also by doing iustice, & so we delivered. Thus
where you apply, *Now* (even at hand) is the iudgement of this
world: *Now* (eve shortly) shall the prince of this world be cast out:
and I, if I were lift up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.
If you meane it in this sense (as you seeme to doe) it serveth well.
But that in this respect, as God proceeded against Satan, and for
this cause Christ should bee cast into these dreadful feares, sor-
rowes, and bloody Agonies, what man of iudgement would ima-
gine? What colour of likelihood is there in it? Rather this were
properly cause of great ioy and triumph indeed: as sufficiently I
have shewed in my former treatise, whatevnes you answer not.
Your testimonies touching a *monstrous* paine, whatevnes may be ad-
mitted another of the like, somewhat opening those places, make
nothing to the purpose at all. For they could not by reason of their
sins make the very presence of Gods Majesty, being in such
danger intended vnto them: but Christ in him selfe being free
from all sinne, could both respect his. No bene also that of
the Agonie (more Describers) do say, that it was the sight of

a Page 1

D. P. 1
c. Aug.d. P. 1
c. 10.176
f. 2
p. 1
b. 1

presence of God the Creator of all: but Christ the Mediator was not a meere Creature, but alwayes personally vnited with a greater power then the Angells were, and alwayes sustayned by it: vnles only in case of his *Iudgement and Passion* proceeding vpon him from God, as is before noted, when purposely the Godhead hid him selfe as it were, and withdrew his wonted Comfort, that the manhood might be subiect to full Punishment for vs, as was appointed by God. Although even now also the Godhead did sustain his manhood thus being overloaden with paine: otherwise it could not but have ben quite overwhelmed. Third: Gods Ma-
 iestie and iustice may be considered sitting in iudgement metely against sinfull men. If you meane heere against the sinnes of the Elect, Christ knew the eternall and sure decree of God which had turned the Cup of vengeance already from them vpon himselfe, as being their Suretie: so that this cometh to our Assertion, as is aforesaid. Or touching the Reprobates doe you think that Christ heere so vehemently wished them better, whom he knew God hated: or that for pitty of them he fell into this Agonie and sorrowful prayers? First Christ saith a little before, He would not so much as pray for them. Yea it is certaine Christ rather would have greatly reioyced to see the due execution of Gods most holy and deserued iustice, which is a speciall part of his high glory. According to that which is written: *The righteous shall reioyce when he seeth the vengeance, he shal wash his feet in the blood of the wicked: And men shall say, verily there is fruit for the righteous, doubtles there is a God that iudgeth the earth.* Againe if Chriestes mournfull prayer were to wish better to the Reprobar, how can that stand where he saith, *Let this Cup passe from me:* he should have saide from them. Neither this also might he say, *from them:* as knowing perfectly his Fathers and his owne will directly to the contrary.

Your next supposed Cause *Compassion* and *mercy* cometh
 1. for the Reuersion of his Church: 2. for the Reuersion of his Church: 3. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 4. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 5. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 6. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 7. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 8. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 9. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 10. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 11. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 12. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 13. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 14. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 15. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 16. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 17. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 18. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 19. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 20. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 21. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 22. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 23. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 24. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 25. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 26. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 27. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 28. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 29. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 30. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 31. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 32. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 33. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 34. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 35. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 36. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 37. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 38. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 39. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 40. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 41. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 42. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 43. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 44. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 45. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 46. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 47. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 48. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 49. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 50. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 51. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 52. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 53. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 54. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 55. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 56. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 57. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 58. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 59. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 60. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 61. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 62. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 63. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 64. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 65. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 66. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 67. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 68. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 69. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 70. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 71. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 72. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 73. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 74. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 75. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 76. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 77. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 78. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 79. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 80. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 81. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 82. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 83. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 84. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 85. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 86. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 87. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 88. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 89. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 90. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 91. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 92. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 93. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 94. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 95. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 96. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 97. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 98. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 99. His zealous grieffe generally for the
 100. His zealous grieffe generally for the

so procure his most dreadfull and bloody Agonie. For the Reire-
tion of the Iewes what reasons bring you. *Christ wept over their*
City: Ergo, Now at his Passion he was driven into his dreadfull A-
gonie for their sake; and that rather now, then when hee so wept ex-
pressly for them. I deny this argument: how will you doe to prove
it? I have shewed from hence the contrary: whereunto nothing
is answered: that seeing when a little before hee thoroughly inten-
ded & expressed his affection about that matter, yet thereby he fell
into no such Agonie, but only wept and mourned for them, there-
fore now in his Passion where he speaketh not a word of them, it
is strange to say, that his Pity of his Countymen the Iewes should
drive him to sweat blood, and thrice to pray with teares and strong
cryes, that this Cup of grief might passe from him; and thrice to
yeeld him selfe againe to Gods will, saying: *Not my Will, but thy*
will be done. This verily cannot stand with any reason: Again, that
his expresse *Compassion* towards the Iewes a little before he pre-
pared him to his Passion, plainly sheweth, that now in the Garden
and so still forward, he gave him selfe wholly to other thoughtes
& matters, Namely such as concerned his great work in hand: that
is, to beare the Paines which now chiefly he was to suffer for mans
redemption at Gods hand: Wherefore this work of Christ at this
time performed and wrought by him, is by a proper and peculiar
Name iustly called his *Passion*, not now his *Compassion*: Againe you
say, *For their sake. Moses desired as he wiped out of Gods booke,*
and Paul could have wished him selfe to bee separated from Christ
for his brethren the Israelites. Ergo Christ at his Passion was cast
into that strange Agonie for the griefe of their refection: This alio
hath no shape of any reason in it. It proueth that Christ surely had
very great pity and commiseration of them, but nothing els in the
worlde. Besides Christ might haue far greater pity of them, then
Moses or Paul had, and yet bee was able to carry his affection far
more patiently and quietly when they were able: which would not
then keepe him from such an outward distemper as was then in
them. Also Christ knew exactly Gods Counsell and purpose for
their refection, which those holy men were not so particularly sure
of. Wherefore Christ might better stay the vehemency & breaking
out of this affection, which in such a case must needs tend against
the known will of God. In those holy men it might haue broken
forth

a Luke 19

b Treat
p. 67c Luk 19
Mat 24

Note

31

37

out

fourth very strongly, as it did, seeing they knew not particularly
 Gods decree heerein, so as Christ knew. Lastly those holy men (it
 seemeth) having their thoughts wholly defixed on their venge-
 ment pety, towards the Jewes earnestly and constantly wished,
 that the Cup of Gods eternal wrath might come vpon them selves
 that the Jewes who deserved it, might scape. But Christ in his Pas-
 sion contrariwise desired that the Cup which hee tasted to be too
 bitter and too violent for him, might passe away from him selfe.
 Thus here is no semblance of reason in this for your purpose. But
 against you heere are 4. worthy things to be noted. If we consider
 this first, that these most fervent desires of these rare men, were
 holy and not sinful. Because their thoughts being wholly & alto-
 gether for the time defixed on their love to their Brethren in the
 flesh that they might be saved, and that Gods glory might be infi-
 nitely more ample, if he saved so many hundred thousands (which
 now almost seemed to them as lost) then it would be in their own
 particular salvation only: and thus for the tyme not thinking (it
 seemeth) vpon their own immutable Election and Salvation nor
 any thing els, saving only that they could desire their brethrens
 salvation yea though it were with their owne damnation for their
 sakes, if God might stand with Gods Will, which no doubt alwayes
 they implied, though expessed not thus I take it plaine enough
 that these sinned not in this their desire, and I suppose you take it
 so too, in that you alleage them & ground your reason of Compa-
 rison ypon them. Nowe from hence I observe these 4. notable
 pointes: 1. That, if God Omnipotent and only Sovereigne Lord
 will, he may inflict Damnation and the paines of Hell vpon men
 not for their selves but for others, not for their own sins but
 for the imputed Sinnes of other men: much rather then may hee
 doethus to Christ, whom God sent indeed and ordayned for that
 purpose. Flatly contrary to your Assertion. That which there
 you mention is the ordinary & common rule, *The sinner shall
 pay it selfe*. But in Christ this was extraordinary and singular
 that *Hee was dyed for the sinners*. 2. We see heere that there may
 be possibly a Death of the Soule, a Curse and Separation fro God
 which is in it selfe neither Sinne, nor employed with sinne neces-
 sarily, but merely a Suffering of Punishment from God for the
 sinnes of others imputed. Contrarie to you also lies generally

specially
 but who
 friendly
 enough
 with Rom.

1. 97.

1. 110.

every where. Third: That extraordinarily there is greater love even among meere men, then only to dy *bodily* one for another, though vſually and ordinarily a greater can not be found among men: which is it, that ^a Christ meaneth. But how much more the may the love of Christ towards his Elect be farre greater. Contrary to ^b your assertion. Fourth: We see here that these holy men without feeling any paines inflicted by Gods wrath, but onely through an earnest and mighty Compassion of love ^c have their *minde* drawn so wholly to thinke on this speciall thing above their reach, that during the time they turne not themselves to any other cogitation. Even as the eye, being bent intēſively to behold any thing, for that present discerneth nothing els. Whereby it cometh to passe that these wishes of these holy men ravished with Pity and Zeale, are not reckoned sinfull in the, though they were directly against their owne Salvatio, which otherwise they knew was immutable with God and certainly reserved for them in Heaven. This you ^d acknowledge may be in men, & yet you will not skoffe at them as ^e cast into a trance by it, nor reproch them with ^f infernall confusion. How much lesse ought you so to deale with Christ: but specially to acknowledge that his marveyulous perplexity may well be a meanes that his suddainwishes against his owne constant purpose & Gods will, were yet no finnes. And that much rather even for this, because Christ had infinitely more cause by his Paines (the felt and feared) to be in his minde both more *amused* and also amazed, then those men had by their affections. Thus far of this. As for the ^g Fathers which ^h you cite, if they meane as they seeme to do that now at his Passion among other causes of sorrow there wated not this, even his great Pity towards his forlorn Countymē, the we ioyne with them. If they meane (as you would have them) that this was the maine and chiefe cause of his extreame sorrows and amazednes, therein I vtterly leave them. Howbeit this heere note in them, that these Fathers avouch *Christ feared not his* (bodily) *Death and Passion*: for thereof only they speake heere questionles. You contrariwise say that *Christ feared* (bodily) *death*, for thereof also ⁱ you discourse, and *had more cause* (as you thinke) *so* to do, then any of his members have.

Third: touching ^k his regard of his Church, generally the same answer serveth, as is given to the last point before. If you vtge that

3.

a Ioh. 15. 13

b Pa. 107. 1

4

c Pag. 298

d Pag. 299

e Pag. 440

f Pag. 299

g Ambros.

Jerom. &

Bede.

h Pag. 298

i Pag. 26.

k Pag. 298

these Fathers are so resolute for these Causes as their wordes heere pretend, then your self abuseth them more the ever I did or meane to do, where you say, *it is curiosity to examine, presumption to determine, impossibility to conclude* (as these doe) *What was the true cause of Christs Agonie.*

Fourth: ^b you alleage his inward sorrow and zealous grief for the *sinnes of the world*, to be the maine and chiefe cause of his Agonie. Surely even to rehearse these your argumets is refutation of them enough. All these are proper parts of his *Holines & Righteousnes*, as I have said, but no proper partes or causes of his bloody & most dreadfull Agonie, that is of his Sacrifice satisfying for sinne. Only his *Paines* were, which then he felt and feared. Neither in respect of these your supposed causes could he say, *Save me from this hower*, nor *Let this Cup passe from me*: as in respect of his infinit paines he might. *This hower* can not be referred to his *Holy and Righteous affections*, which were at all howers and seasons in him without measure Holy, yet now at his death did not so expressly break out & shew themselves, "as they did at divers times before. Therefore *this Hower* can not be these his Holy affections: his Paines & afflictions they ^d may be and must bee. Neither thus standeth it with his *piety* to wish that his strong and vehement affections of *Holynes* should *passe from him*, or bee weakened in him. For my part I can see no sense nor sap in these assertions. Even so likewise in that, where you ascribe to this his *deepe sorrow* of zeale for mens sinnes his *sweating bloud* in his agonie about nature *after a strange and marvelous manner*. I dare say, you deliver strange met-vayles in Divinity.

The Fift Cause ^f you say, *might be the Cup of Gods Wrath tempered & made ready for the sinnes of men*: which you interpret to be *an Eternall Malediction*. Touching which you say, *Christ knowing what our sinnes deserved might intensively pray to have that Cup passe from him, which was prepared for us*. For vs, whom meane you? The Elect, or the Reprobar? What malediction? The whole & absolut Paines thereof only, or the *Eternity* of the continuance thereof also? For so the Reprobats do suffer it. If you meane the Elect, Christ knew, that he must not only *see & contemplat*, but *feele & suffer* all the whole Paines of that Punishment which our sinnes deserved: and this was prepared for himselfe our Ransome

payer, and not for vs. Wherefore the truth is he could not by any meanes pray against that nor decline that, onely vnles he were for the time in some *astonishment & perturbation of his senses*, which by the infinitnes of that Paine he might well bee in, yea he could not but be (in his Humane weake nature) and yet still remayning vtterly sinlesse, as is afore shewed to have happened in Moses and Paul in a far lesse perturbation then this was in Christ. Now this is the very point of our Defense: affirme this, and you affirme with vs all that we hold & professe. Otherwise if you meane that Christ *prayed intently* to have the whole and intire Cup of eternall Malediction and death passe from him, which both the Elect deserve, and the Reprobats sustaine, that, as it is passing strange doctrine, so it is also simply impossible. For he could not intently pray against that, nor feare that, which hee most perfidly knew concerned him not at all, and by no meanes could ever possibly come neere him. But indeed all this is nothing els in effect then your 1 Cause, *His submission to Gods maiesty sitting in iudgment*. Wherefore you might have lessened your number, and so your answer to this might have ben thesame which is made to your formost. But heere furthermore you knit in with this 4 other seuerall causes of Christs Agony. 1. *His taking of our infirmities in his flesh to cure them*: 2. *His breaking the knot betwixt (bodily) death and Hell, which none but hee was able to do*: 3. *Gods anger which might be executed on his body, but was mitigated by him*: 4. *The desire he had to continue the feeling & intoying of Gods presence with his body*. The 1. of these maketh in my minde much for vs. For vnderstanding that Christ tooke all the infirmities and passions wherevnto mens nature is subiect to the ende that hee might cure all and every kinde of them in vs; then it followeth that he wanted not the *proper & immediat sufferings* of paines inflicted by Gods own hand in his Soule. For these are our Soules subiect vnto and capcable of, yea and tormeted with, & finally we are by this apt and proportionable medicine of Christ throughly cured of the. And this is the very same matter w^{ch} our 4 Argument before concluded: that Christe had experince of thesame infirmities & passions generally whatsoever, wherof he hath cured vs. And this your owne Authours here doe fully affirme, *Cyrril, Ambrose*, and others, as before we have obserued. It is then most vn-

a As you
kon the
geather
27.

I.

a Pag. 8
85.

a Pag. 8

p. 15, 26, 27

Before pag.

11.

pag. 19.

mbr. Ierom.

de.

pag. 15.

Who yet
think not at
either for
lily paines
for Reli-
ous fear of
all.

p. 26.

pag. 161.

p. 189.

pag. 25.

p. 317.

reasonable which heere ^c you doe (if you doe as you seeme) to vn-
derstand them of meere Bodily death, & of the infirmities meely
of his Flesh. Wherein then you deny our ^d Assumption also, & are
againē Contrarie to your selfe and to ^f your owne Authours. Cy-
rill nameth *flesh* heere, meaning not Christes Deitie, but his whole
Humane nature, as the Scripture doeth in a multitude of places;
and so not his Body onely. Thus then it is that he saith, as you ob-
serue, that *Christ as a man abhorred and feared death*; not the bo-
dily death only, but as it was conioyned with the sorrowes of the
2. death. He would not, he could not so feare and be afrighted, yea
and pitiously astonished with such sorrowe oppressing him, as to
sweat droppes of blood only for feare of his bodily death: neyther
would he *pray* at all, much lesse so vehemently and so oftentimes
as he did against that which he perfectly knew was Gods will and
his own most willing purpose to vnderghe. Or els Cyrill meaneth
no more but that he naturally misliked & shunned (eye as all flesh
doth) all bodily paine & death. This we alwayes yeeld, and it ma-
keth nothing against vs. For neuertheles he constantly embraced &
suffered with ioy whatsoever bodily grief he knew did come vnto
him by his owne most free wil, and by the holy ordinance of God:
yea he could & would beare it with ioy far beyond all the ioy and
constancie of ^h men in their sufferings. Only he might faile of the
outward appearance and vse of this constancie and ioyfull patience
(as now he did) without taint of sinne, if his Humane nature were
overwhelmed with other infinit paynes, and his minde and senses
disturbed with more horreur then naturally it could beare. Ther-
fore I conclude he thus feared not his meere bodily death, but it
was the Paines of the 2. death which he felt and so feared. But you
say *The sorrow and feare of death which is pleased our Saviour to
feele in our nature, came not for want of strength, but of purpose to
quench and abolish those affections in vs.* I say it came from both:
as your selfe also doe avouch cleane contrarily in an other place:
To dy even in Christ was infirmities, though voluntary. And ge-
nerally in another place; *Naturall infirmities was common to Christ
with all the godly in like cases.* Wherefore Austins sentence will not
helpe you heere, ^m that *Christ was troubled not by infirmities, but by
(his owne) power.* For he meaneth, not only by infirmities, but also
by his owne will and power; or els you confute him your selfe.

ther is this any *reproch* to Christ, as ^a you most iniustly insinuat. But as it was glorious to him so to debase his Maiestie for our sakes to take our true and perfit Nature, yea to bee humbled therein to the most shamefull death of the Crosse, so was it also glorious to him to take all the true weakneses of our nature together: and so it was his singular good-will towards vs to become throughly like vs, and feelingly subiect to all our Calamities, paines and miseries, to heale vs of them. Only in him the guilt and corruption of sinne it selfe was excepted. Faine you would ^o wipe away that Argumēt of ours which sticketh neerer to you the you will seeme. In Malefactors there is a quiet and contented suffering of most exquisite and extraordinary torments oftentimes, which they indure only by a naturall strength and courage of minde. Howe much more likely is it then that Christ the very rock of all strength and fountaine of patience, would not thus seeme affrighted and astonished and so woefully behaving him selfe for his meere bodily death, and that before it came vnto him. All your answer is, that this is *no fit comparison* for the Sonne of God: for they are desperate, not having any feare or care of God till they feelee the force of his wrath in Hell fyre. What an answer is this? They have no feare nor care of God. What then? Yet naturally they have feare and care of most bitter paines, and namely then when they feelee them. If you say, before they feelee them they are so desperate and so hardened by Satan, that they care not for any tormentes: that in deed is commonly true. But what will you or can you alleage to hinder their full and most dreadfull sense of them, when they are in them? Satan wisheth them not so much good as to benumme them now in their senses, so that the cruell paines of death should not trouble them in the time of their death, which hee would rather make more fearfull and intollerable vnto them. Let them be then in their life time as *desperate* as they will, yet in death and in the midst of most horrible torments which oftentimes very quietly they indure, surely they cannot choose but feelee as liuely and as *perfitly* as other men doe. Only it is a naturall boldnes and strength of minde (in it selfe no discommendable propertie) that sustayneth them in such extreme paines: One instance for all may serue in this kinde, even that wretched Murderer of the Prince of Orange in Netherland. What strange quietnes did he shew in suf-

fering most wonderfull and rare tormentes vntill death. Nowe to make our Saviour Christ lesse able or willing to suffer quietly outward tormentes no greater then that wretch and many other such have suffered, I suppose is a bad indeavour. And it is no vnfit matter for you to thinke more vpon, before you skip it over with silence. We compare not the Sonne of God with them, but are sure that his Humane nature had beyond all comparison more commendable courage, boldnes, strength of minde, patience, and contentment even in the midst of his extreamest paines (were they but meere bodily) then such caytifs had, or possibly could seeme to have. This that I say, pertaineth alike to the Theeves that were Crucified with Christ. Of whom the H. Ghost saith, *" They were togeather in one and the same Condemnation with Christ. That is they suffered from men all one and the like tormentes of death adiudged them by the Magistrate: except happily Christ suffered lesse then they, because they indured them longer then hee did. Yet we finde in none of them any such piteous and strange Complaintes and Cryes and Teares, as we finde in Christ. But to leave these, and to come to the patience of Martyrs in their sufferings, That also is admirable, what ioy, what peace, what triumph they shew, yea how they sing in the midst of frying flames, in their roasting on gridirons, in their fleaing off their skinner, and tearing of their fleshe by piece-meales, with a thousande other of most strange and butcherly tormentes, no lesse, if no greater in outward shewe, then the sufferings of our Saviour Christ. To this you answer: If death be not fearfull to the Seruants of Christ, they are the more bound to their Lord and Maister. Who knoweth not that But what answer is this to our argument? And you will also give a reason of your saying: Because he was the first that by death disarmed death, and severed Death and Hell. He was surely both the first and the last: both *a* and *o*. For he *only*, and none with him, nor before nor since him conquered Death and Hell. Yet what is this to our Reason? The effect that Christ wrought is not our question, but *" the manner and kinde of suffering whereby he wrought it. You tell vs of the effect which he performed which we gladly acknowledge: viz. that Christ did this, in deed by his death; he made our death since to be no Cursed death, but a blessed death. But how did he this, by suffering nothing but his most**

the matter
or Ob-
and the
fect of his
suffering are
question.

bodily death only, or also a Religious feare of Hell? All which other godly men doe also suffer and feelee, which they take passing joyfully and quietly. But thus Christ did not seeme to doe, neither indeed did he in his Agonie. Or did Christ suffer some greater sorrow? You say, *The death which Christ suffered when it approached came fast clasped with Hell.* What meane you by that? meane you, that Death and Hell both alike came iointly vpon Christ, and that both iointly were ordayned of God to seaze vpon him? Then it is the same that wee affirme. Otherwise how came they *clasped together* against him? By breaking the knot betwixt Death and Hell, he could not be so woefully affected and afflicted above measure as he was, if he did not suffer by them somewhat extraordinarily. Vnto this you have nothing to answer. Only you say, *he severed them*, and none els but only the Sonne of God could dissolve them. Which we deny not. Neither can we see how Death by Gods ordinance might seaze vpon Christ, and not the paines of Hell: seeing neither of them is in themselves sin, but both alike are the due vengeance of sinne which he was ordayned to suffer so far as was possible. Why then did he suffer the one, and not touch the other. Neither yet do you shew that *which* you take in hand heere, how *bodily death is contemptible to the Godly which was not contemptible to God himselfe* by your assertio. It was not therefore that onely, but some other death farre more dreadful and intollerable, which made Christ man (being also God) in such wise to tremble and quake. In deed *Christ had farre greater cause* (as you say) *to feare even his bodily death, then any of his Members have.* For it was therefore *because death approached vnto him clasped fast with Hell*, so that he could not by the ordinance of God meddle with one but he must feelee the other. And thus he did not *contemplate* and looke on them a farre off, nor had to doe with one more then the other, but by suffering one, he felt both: and by induring one, he indured both. And thus in deed Christ was left by God to the full naturall sense of his bodily torments. But the Godly and the Martyrs deale only with bodily Death; the paines of Hell, or of Gods wrath they feare not, because they know by Christes suffering the same they are abolished, & removed farre from them. Sin standeth not threatening the in the presence of God, as it stood now at this time against Christ our Suretie and Ransom-payer. Nay, they

they deale not with Bodily death wholly and naturally : for they have Gods comfort with them to mitigate it, which Christ nowe felt not. Yea they mind not their paines very much for their great hope and ioy presenly following : but this was all overclouded in Christ at this instant. Therefore he had exceeding great cause to be affrighted and terrifyed & to cry out with bitter teares, though the godly have cause to triumph & sing in Death. Thus also you forget *my argumēt: that Christ alwayes charged his Disciples not to take their bodily Death heavily for righteousness sake: *Ergo*, He him selfe would never be so dismayed with the feare of it. Heere you have a notable sayinge in the margen, whiche must not be forgotten : we must preferre Christes suffering before all Martyrs **not for his paines, but for his patience.* Not for his paines, but for his patience? A rare distinction : If you could make vs believe that the greatest patience is tryed and discerned where the smallest paines are, then you said somewhat. I know Christes patience was perfitt in all his paines both small & great: and so is not the patience of his servants in their paines neither small nor great. But what is this to our purpose? We speake not of his inward *habitus* of patience which our faith beleeveth to be in him : but of the outward *triall and discerning* thereof by naturall meanes & signes wherevnto it pleased him now to submit his patience after the verie course and operation of Nature. Wherefore as Christ had in him indeed farre more patience then we have, so it is out of doubt when he came to the chiefest trial thereof in his Passion he would not in any wise (as he did) shewe lesse in vse then many men doe, vnles the trial & encoūtring thereof in him were infinitely greater.

3. By this also we may see how vaine your next coniecture is, that
 12. 24. he feared in his Agonie "*Corporall castigation above his strength.*" For why may not Martyrs and others feare as much cruelty & extraordinary torments at the handes of men, as Christ had cause to doe? Againe, why should the feare of any whatsoever meere bodily paines so overcome his patience, as outwardly it seemed at this time? Why should he not be able to beare it quietly? And principally seeing he knew well enough before what his death should be, and that God had vchangeably appointed it for him. Wherefore in no wise ought he so to shunne and shrink from his meere bodily paines, if they were no greater, which hee suffered.

If you meane that he felt greater concurring in and with his bodily punishment inflicted by the wrathfull hand of God, ^a *armed with infinit vengeance*, then you say well, and we acknowledge it. a Pag. 24
b Pag. 29

Your other ^c Cause is, for that by death his body should want a while the feeling of Gods presence. But did not Christ perfectly know that this was Gods decree and certaine appointment; yea his owne most free will & purpose? And shall we imagine that Christ would expresse pray against that knowen will of his Father, yea against his owne? Call you this ^d *greater perfection* in him then was in other men? Again, could this thing in any reason be such a horrible griefe vnto him, to have his fleshly dead without paine for a day and a few howers, yet his Soule continually living and inioying the comfort of God: and that for such an occasion as to procure thereby the Salvation of mankinde, would the thought of this make him *sweat blood* for grief, and *to need an Angell from heauen to comfort him*, and *to pray 3. times vehemently that this Snp might passe from him*? verily it is vnrasonable to thinke so. Which Cause also, if it were true, is flatly contrary to your ^e owne resolution. But of all these I wonder where you have found anie inkling, that any of these may be beleaved to bee the true and effectuall cause of Christes most dreadfull Agonie. You say excellent^f well, but by your practise in all matters so farre as I see, you never meane to observe it: *3 in Gods cause let Gods booke teach us what to beleeve and what to professe: h I loue to followe and not to lead the holy Ghost. In matters of so great depth I dare not wade without or before my guide.* Again ⁱ *what I reade in Gods worde, that I beleeve: what I read not, that I doe not beleue.* Shewe mee then where you read in Gods word any or all these to be effectuall Causes of this strange Agonie, or some sure grounde whence evidently we may gather so much: or els for my part I shall never be-
ver beleeve you. c Pag. 24
d Pag. 29
e Pag. 29
f As be have pag. 23
g Epist. h Pag. 29
i Pag. 40

Your Sixt and last maine Cause is, that Christ by this his *bloody sweat* and vehement prayers did nothing but voluntarily performe that true bloody Offering and Priesthood prefigured in the Law. This we simply grant: it hindreth not our Assertion. Except you meane *voluntarily* in such sense that hee was not also vrged therevnto by any violence of paines or feare procuring it in him naturally. Wherein you seeme to labour by bringing some Fa-
thers, k Pag. 29
l co.

thers, and misapplying some Scriptures, and doe say that *"you are
 content to admit also (this) exposition, and of this, with all the rest
 you pronouce that they are sound and well agreeing with Christian
 pietie. Yet is it contrary to your resolution also: yea it is contrary
 to the Scripture, exprelling his feare and vehement sorrowes
 and discomfort to have caused his Agonie. Againe if you meane
 that all this was voluntary in him and not felt indeede according
 to the outwarde semblance and as men beholding him would
 judge, then belike you make him to have counterfayted. Which
 thought God forbid should ever come into any Christians heart.
 For no cause you say I leest and iye be with the Apostles word:
 but I feare this is to leest and iye be in deed with the most dreadfull
 and bitter sorrowes of our Saviour in working for vs our Salvati-
 on. And heere why say you not aswell that his Death and blood-
 shed on the Crosse shewed in him no paines nor infirmities, but
 only that voluntarily he made him selfe there the true Priest, and
 performed the prefigured bloody and deadly Sacrifice for the sins
 of the world. As good reason altogether you have to say so, as to
 affirme it of his Agonie. As for the Scriptures which you cite,
 they prove in deed that Christ nowe executed his office of Priest-
 hood: but will you divide & exempt his Death on the Crosse fro
 his Priesthood? The sanctifying of him self doeth it not as well in-
 tend and comprehend that Sacrifice on the Crosse, as that of his
 Prayers in the Garden? To thinke otherwise is without all shewe
 of truth or reason, yet I see not why you should cite these
 textes, vnles you meant so: neither can I see what els you meane,
 where you conclude saying, *Christes Agonie being alleaged by the
 Apostle to demonstrat Christes Priesthood, must not rise fro the ter-
 ror of his own death. And yet a little before you openly doe con-
 fesse and grant, that his Agonie did rise from the feare of his death,
 and that Christ had farre greater cause then any of his members to
 feare it. Also it is contrary to your citing of Cyrill pag. 25. And
 heere why should I deny that Christes bloody sweat came
 of infirmities? Or Austin, that his feare and perturbatio was of in-
 firmities? Surely there is no cause. For though it be against the co-
 mon course of our Nature, for any paines or feare to sweat blood
 yet the Divine power with and through paines and feares might
 wring out of his body that trickling bloody sweat. As it is plain
 that**

pag. 39.

pag. 37.

pag. 290.

mark 14.

3. 14.

lebr. 5. 7.

Lnc. 22. 43.

pag. 302.

pag. 39.

Or his
 sinnes and
 infirmities
 sheweth?

pag. 37.

pag. 18.

pag. 25.

that it did by the wordes next before in the text, *An Angell came* so give him some comfort, that is, least hee should have bene overwhelmed quite in his sorrow and discomfort: but still he was in his Agonie, and swee like droppes of blond trickling to the ground: and presently saith, *My Soule is full of sorrowes even to death*, and thrice he prayed that this Cup, and this Hower might passe from him. It cannot be therefore but that by Sorrowes and Paines this sweate came: though also Gods power caused it by laying vpon his Soule and body invisible, supernaturall, & vnspeakable torrowes and horrors, and by making his fleshe visibly to expresse in some sort this spirituall and extraordinary torment of paine and feare which he suffered. And in deed where they say, *Nec infirmitas, quod potestas gessit*, that proveth the cleane contrary: For *Idcirco infirmitas, quia potestas gessit*. For the working of his Power in him argueth the suffering of his Infirmitie: *The power of God is persisted in infirmitie*. And because it was above the course of nature, therefore nature was herein oppressed, not exempted from paines. Thus these speak fully for vs and against you, that heere appeared, not *Christes infirmity* only in suffering, but his *Divine power* also in punishing. And this I iudge in deed to bee their very meaning. But those other mysticall and figuratiue sayings of *Austin*, *Bede*, & *Bernard*, howe shall we admit them without better warrant? That *Christes bloodshed* was to signifie that Martyrs should shed their blood, what reason have we so to thinke? Or that his blood head should signifie the purging of his Disciples hearts from sinne, yea or of all his Church in the whole world? It did not signifie this, but it did it in deed. Lastly, if it had these significations in it, yet withall his Agonie might rise from his very Paines & Feare comming from the present sense of Gods iustice and wrath nowe revealed and working vpon him.

Hitherto we have made it manifest that in trueth you have nothing in all these wordes against our doctrine, that *Paines and sorrowes were the true and proper cause of Christes dreadfull Agonie*: nor to prove that his meere bodily paines or death was the whole Cause. Now we are to shew the like in his most wofull Complaint on the Crosse; where he saith *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* You will aske me heere, what kinde of Forsaking may this be? I shewed you plainly before, if you had regarded it.

1 Not Infir-
ty but Po-
did this
2 Therefor
there was
firmity
cause the
was Po-

Pag. 107.

Math. 27.

* Treat. 1.

6465

Namely, that Christ being also now (yea specially) in the feeling of infinit Paines inflicted on him sundry wayes, and that directly fro Gods proper Wrath for our finnes, he felt his whole Humane nature for the time *left all comfortles and alone* without any ioyous assistance of his Deitie. I say not, that he wanted now all assistance of his Deitie: for it surely would then have quite overwhelmed him with this intollerable burdē. But his Godhead, as it were withdrawing and hiding it selfe from him for that season of his Passion, gave him no sense nor feeling of ease, comfort, or ioy, but all the sense of sorrowes and paines as well in spirit, as in soule and body, that might bee: all the sense of his ioy and comfort for the while being cleane gone and wholly swallowed vp in that huge & bottomles gulse of sorrowes and paynes issuing vpon him out from the fierce Wrath of God. Howbeit yet even now he wanted not sufficient assistance of the Deitie to sustayne him in life heerein, as I said. This was that extreeme humiliation and *exinanition* of nature, wherein † *God spared not his Sonne*, and wherein also Christ spared not him selfe. For hee vndertooke all this most willingly: and yet being in it naturally grieved and sorrowed for it, & at some moments being astonished with it, suddenly and naturally desired ease and release from it. This *forsaking* or *dereliction* becometh the time, place, person, and case of Christ our Ransompayer, and Purchaser of salvation with the price of his owne most direfull paines. Not any other farre fet, or hardly applyed, or strangely deuised by the braynes of men. As in trueth all those other senses heereof are, which “ you rather imbrace. They are 6. in number. The 1. is, that when Christ on the Crosse cryed out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, by this word *me*, he should meane *His Church*. For the which you have no reason in the world, but the bare names of *Austin, Leo, Athanasius*. Shew me their reasons, presse not their authorities. Which “ your selfe also reiecteth, when you list: though when you list againe they must be your best, yea your only reason. But even these Fathers if they be vnderstood, as before I have shewed *Cyprians* meaning to be: that Christ spake these wordes, as doing now the part of the Suretie of his Church, and as standing in the case of his Children whom now by his suffering paines he saved: then they agree with our minde herein. For then doubtles it was for the infinite paines

Christ on
Crosse was
taken of
od. See also
g. 113. 113

Phil. 2. 7.
Rom. 8. 32.
Mat. 10. 17.
Luc. 16. 17.

g. 24. &c.
r 6. Expo-
sitions of
Christes Co-
munt, are all
true.

1.

See before
g. 38. 39.

g. 79.

paines which now he felt in our steed, that he so cryed out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Otherwise if you thinke they meant that Christ spake this by some strange *Metonymy*, naming him selfe but meaning his Church: that can have no good sense. For how can it be that *we were forsaken of God* when Christ was on the Crosse. Nay, even there and then *were we* "*purchased*" " Act. 20.
unto God, not forsaken by God. Againe your owne rule is, which I like well, that no Figure is to bee admitted in Scripture where there is no ill nor hurtfull sense following literally. But I have shewed a little before a plaine, easie, and Christian sense heereof, taking it literally: that *me* signifieth Christes owne person namely his Manhood bearing nowe, as our Suretie, intollerable paines inflicted by Gods wrath vpon him: and so he may mourne & sorowe that he was *forsaken*, that is *left in unmeasurable paines without feeling of any comfort or succour* for the tyme. Wherefore neither you nor any of the Fathers ought to conceave that *me* heere should signifie not Christ properly, but the Church Figuratively. What other construction you can make heereof, I can not discern. Finally, this 1. sense is contrary to your 2. and 3. following: also to your 5. and 6. senses. If eyther of these be taken as the true meaning of this place, it cannot possibly stande with the rest: although you allow them all, as by and by we shall manifestly see. Now then your 2. sense, what is it? Even this, that Christs humane nature was left helples to the rage of the Iewes; which is a kinde of forsaking. This seemeth to come neere indeed to your liking, by that which I observe in ^ayou. But as I said, this is directly contrary to your 1. sense, & to the rest following. Also ^b before we saw how greatly Christes sufferings specially on the Crosse differed from such, as the godly doe also suffer. Yea there is surely no reason nor shew of reason, that Christ heere should so mournfully and so vncomfortably complaine that God had *forsaken him*, if it were only but for such distresses as the godly also doe equally suffer at the hands of evill men. Seeing most of the at the bower of their martyrdoms doe never vtter any such shew (as Christ heere did) of a minde vncomforted. Where also note this well, that no godly man nor Martyr did ever ascribe this forsaking of themselves to God in the time of their martyrdomes. For though then they are oppressed with greater violence of bodily enemies, yet they are as-

lifted with far greater abundance of heavenly comfort, even in the
 midst of the paines of death. So that they never mourne nor
 complaine at such extreme dealing, as Christ now did, when hee
 said *my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.* Wherefore it is a
 great shame to imagine that Christ was lesse able to indure such a
 dereliction, or that he would thus complaine and mourne for it
 only. The bare names againe of *Austin, Ambrose, Hierom* doe
 heere likewise no good. This is but a weake kind of reasoning for
 so learned a Divine as you are. Although also these very sentences
 of the Fathers I can easily admit, if they import no more then they
 seeme: namely that these outward afflictions on the Crosse were
 some cause (and that not small) of his complaint, alwayes remem-
 bring that some greater cause also did concurre & was conioyned
 with them. Your 3. sense if I conceive it a right is, that his being
 left to bodily death caused him thus to mourne which is but as the
 last before. And yet you seeme to meane not onely that, but al-
 so because his *flesh* now should want all feeling of his heavenly
 comfort for that while, that it should remaine dead. A marvelous
 exquisit & far fet cause. Yet me thinks, as this crosseth your other
 expositions heere, so it is flat contrary to the Scripture also: which
 giveth after a sort to Christs dead *Flesh* this lively affection, *my
 flesh shall rest in hope*, because thou wilt not leave my soule to re-
 maine as all other flesh dying doth, in the vnseene worlde of the
 dead, neither wilt suffer *thy holy one* to see corruptiō. Is it likely is it
 possible that he should so dolefully mourne that either he should
bodily dy, or that his *body* should want the sense of his divine pre-
 sence so little a while, when as in his mind hee speaketh so trium-
 phantly of his constant and continuall ioy in God: yea not exclu-
 ding even his *body* though dead from participating in some sort
 therein: as we read in the former place at large. *I beheld the Lord
 always before me, for he is at my right hand that I should not be sha-
 ken. Therefore did my heart reioyce & my tongue was glad, & more-
 over my Flesh shall rest in hope, &c.* Now can a man in this excee-
 ding generall and constant ioy so vncomfortably mourne, in that
 sense as you vrge, *My God my God, why forsakest thou my flesh?*
 It cannot be. Many thinges more may be strongly alleaged against
 this opiniō. As first: seeing he perfectly knew tharth as his *flesh* now
 should quietly rest, and have a present ende of all his most bitter

that you
 His God-
 and depar-
 nowe fro
 body. &c.

2. 26. 27

sorrowes, so even all that while & continually after, his soul (which was his best part) should enjoy perfect glory and comfort more then before it did: Also seeing this senseles rest of his flesh was to be but for a very little while, & then presently to receive a most glorious and eternall felicity jointly with his Soul and with his Deity, who can imagine that Christ would (now ready to dy) so extreamely mourne and complaine only for this cause, as your fancy importeth? Further he knew perfectly that this was the very appointment of God, and for the fulfilling of Prophecies, for the obtrayning of his most desired purchase of our health, for the more advancing of Gods glory, yea and for the more advancing of his very manhood also after so low humiliation. Finally it was his own most free and fore determined will. Would hee then so mournfully grieve and complaine thereat? It hath no reason, nor likelyhood in it. Lazarus when he was returned from the ioyes of heaven to take againe his rotten carcase after it stanke having lyen 4. dayes dead in the grave, yet he grieved not at it, neither ought he so to have don. Much lesse ought Christ so to grieve and mourne, for a lesser want and for a shorter season (as we may thinke) then that was to Lazarus. But this matter is not worth the speaking of any further. Neither doe your Fathers prove any such improbable, yea vnlawfull mourning & complaining in Christ. If they prove any thing towards your meaning, it is this, that he complained because of his bodily dying. Howbeit they say not that he thus complained only and meerely for that: neither I thinke will you plainly hold this, neither doe wee deny the other. The truth is they meane he suffered in his whole Humane nature: & namely that he suffered not as God. They strove heere with Heretiques, whose controversies were far from this our question. Hilary and Epiphanius wrote against Arius, to prove that Christ in this complaint shewed rightly a humane infirmity; and that this was not the voice of a Deity inferiour to the Father, as Arius blasphemed. These Fathers then had no purpose heere to exclude the sufferings of Christs Soule, but only to deny that his Godhead suffered & complained as being left to punishment by his Father, when the sorrowes of death began to prevaile against him. The very same doth Hilary also where he saith that this in Christ was *corporis vox*, the outcry of his body. He plainly meaneth it of his whole manhood, the opposition being

John 92

See to this pag.

How the
thers are
taken.Hilary
Trin. 2.Epiphanius
Against
Arianism.In Mar
can. 33.

Treat. 1.
pg. 9.

Tertul. cont.
Prax.
Hila. in Mat.
an. 11.

here pag.
11.
at f. pa. 4

Death
Soule in
it woe

being betweene it and his Godhead: as the Scripture often doth. And where he saith, he was *morte peragendus*, to be consummated by death: he meaneth that death ended all his suffering, not that hee suffered nothing els but meere death. And if their words do any where come neere to our question, as it is very likely that *Ter-
tullian* and the one place of *Hilary* doth, then surely they are plain-ly for vs and against you. Tertullian pointeth in this place at cer-taine Hæresies maintained in his time wherwth it seemeth *Praxeas* was infected. 1 That the Father suffered as well as the Sonne when Christ suffered: 2 That the Deity suffered: 3 That Christ was no true nor perfect man. All these pointes Tertullian overthroweth heere, *Quid de isto queris, &c.* What inquire you of Christ? Thou heere him crying out in his Passion, *My God my God why hast thou forsaken me?* The Sonne therefore suffered, being forsaken of his Father: but this is meant of the Flesh and of the Soule, that is of the Man, not of the Word nor of the Spirit. Heere it is plaine that *Ter-
tullian* sheweth besides the rest, this point exactly, that Christ was a very man, in that he had a proper Body and a Soule, and that this his suffering on the Crosse was in both these partes, and so in his whole & intire manhood. Also that he suffered in both these parts even frō his Father. But he could not suffer in his Soule frō God, if he felt only and meere bodily death, as you hold. And to suffer the stroke of Gods hand in his Soule as the proper venge-ance of sin, is farre more then to feele in Soule by sympathy only the bodies smart. Neither had *Tertull.* overthrowe but confirmed that Hæresie of Christs being no true natural man, if he had said, that in this case he suffered in Soule only by sympathy with and from the Body. But this is absurd to thinke in *Tertullian*. There-fore in this place he is flarly against you. And this *Derelictio* of his Father which he speaketh of, is *Death* indeed to the Sonne. But what death? Forsooth more then the separation of the Soule and Body. Even the separation of the Deity from the whole manhood which is the death of the Soule. I speake heere nothing but the Fathers words, yea the Scriptures. Your owne place of *Epiphanius* saith that nowe his Deity departed from his manhood. So saith your owne *Hilary* also, *Corporis vox comestit a recedentis a se De
disidium*. So saith *Ambrose*, *Clamavit Homo Divinitas se
sient moriturus*: The man Christ did cry being about to dy by the
paradise

paration of his Godhead. Againe *Sequestrata delectatione Divinitatis aeterna radio mea infirmitatis afficitur.* The joy of his eternall Godhead being parted away, hee was afflicted with the tediousness of my infirmitie. Heere the Fathers doe shewe in deed that Christ dyed, but more then a meere bodily death: even the death of the Soule also. For what is the Separation of the Deitie from his Soule els, but the death of the Soule. Howbeit note, I pray, that neither the Fathers, nor I do meane any Separating¹ of the vnion of^a both natures in Christ, nor the Separating² of any Holynes or habitual grace of God from his Soule, nor the Separating of Gods love from him, but the Separatiō of all comfortable feeling & assistance of the Godhead, in that he felt not any supporting of his Soule and Body now pierced thorow with the Paines which he felt inflicted by God. This Separatiō is meant, and it^b may be called the Death of the Soule. For as it is^c life to the Soule to feele and to enioy the glorie of God: So it is death to feele the want and absence thereof utterly, and the rather being also then overwhelmed with incomparable paines. That heavenly life Christ tasted a litle while in his Transfiguratiō: this Hellish Death he felt besides his bodily death vpon the Crosse. And thus Tertull. meaneth heere that not Christs bodily death only made him now thus to cry out, but that death also which was the Separation of his Godhead from both his body & Soule; which is the death of the Soule. And so he saith true: the Dereliction of the Father, is Death to the Sonne. Your^d 4. Exposition for any thing I see may be granted: for it seemeth to bee the same in effect that wee holde. Your place of Cyrill seemeth also to concur: that Christes words of complaint were the removing of the dereliction which had fallen on vs. Was it removed from vs? then surely it was laid vpon some body els. Now that must needes be vpon him selfe. Where you obiekt Athanasius, that He could not be forsaken of his Father, who was alwayes in his Father. It is meere wretched: Athanasius speaketh against Arius also, that Christes Deitie could not be forsaken of his Father, seeing it is alwayes in his Father: and so was not inferior to the Father, which was Arius heresy. Touching his humanity he denyeth not but God might forsake it: For the Scripture saith so. And in deed he forsooke it by causing in it the feeling of all Paines for sinne, and by leaving it therein for a while all comfortles. Your 5. Exposition

a The D
& Hum

See b
pag. 10

b There
happ
there
this
rarely
c Phil

d Pag

Cont.
Serm

5

is *Leos* conceit without warrant, far fetcht, hardly applyed: *that* heere Christ putteth vs in minde why God doth often not heare our prayers, but provideth better for vs then if our wils were satisfied: *that* that this is a mysticall sense. * *Origen* also is heere as weake: *that* Christ meaneth nothing ells but that hee was abased lower then his divine maiesty. Also these senses be contrary to all the rest heere observed. Your 6. and last also is likewise as contrary to the rest, and as improbable in it self (or more) then the former. That Christ heere should cite the beginning of that *b* Psalme, only to shew the Jewes that their wrongs towards him were Prophesied of before. This *c* already I fully answered, which you refute not. Likewise where you say, He sung the whole Psalme: it is, *d* answered. When moreover this is to be noted, that surely hee now vntered no more of this Psalme but the 1. verse, *Eli, Eli, Lamma sabachthani*. For heereby the standers by imagined that he called for *Elias*. Therefore he sung not the Psalme. Your authorities are bare arguments. *Ierom* bringeth no reason but his own word. *Chrysostom*, I see not what he saith to your purpose at all. Finally those kindes of Dereliction which you mention *e* besides, are nothing fitter then the former. Thus far I have waded in examing your sundry and variable expositions of one poore little plaine sentence of Scripture. At least 6. or 7. diuers, yea contrary senses you have brought of a few wordes: & of them all you say, They are *f* all godly expositions, and *g* All these interpretations are sound, and stand well with the rules of Christian pietie. How sound and fit they are, it hath bene seene. But verily you have a good head if you can reconcile all these: and make them stand together: and a very bad opinion of the holy Scriptures you seeme to have, if you thinke they may be handled by interpretations and expositions thus, that a man may take them in 6. or 7. diuers senses and all iustificable. Your saying therefore, that *h* you have spoken before as much (to this matter) as may content any man that is not fastened to his fancies more then to the truth, I omit as vaine and frivolous.

Now it resteth that I gather some reasons from the expresse Scripture, to shew you that indeed very paine and the vehemency of sorrowes, namely which hee now sustayned by way of yeelding Satisfaction and Sacrifice for sinne, were the principall and onely proper Cause of his most dreadfull Agonies & Complaint. Which

truly though it neede no reason for prooffe of it, (the matter being so cleere in it selfe) yet your vnreasonableness is such that it draweth somewhat from me about it. First, No Christian doubteth (I suppose) much lesse denyeth that Christs most wofull Agonies & Complaining belonged properly and directly to his Passion and Sacrifice: and that they expressed a parte thereof, yea as I thinke not the least parte. But his whole Sacrifice consisted in Afflictions, *The Prince of our Salvation was consecrated through Afflictions.* Therefore *Afflictions Sorrows and Paines* were the Cause of his Agonies and Complaint: not his *religious feare*, not his *Pity* or *Pity*. If you say, These were Afflictions vnto him. I answer, they properly belonged to his Holynes as partes thereof, and were not immediately directly nor properly in him as the Wages & Price of sinne: as his whole Passion was, and every part thereof. Againe that these should, or could afflicte Christe so much above his strength and patience, it is more then strange. Yea also it were no vertue but sinne in any, to give way to our Affections (though about good thinges) immoderately beyond our patience & strength of nature. Lastly though they somewhat molest the minde, yet in truth they are most pleasing and delightfull to good men, not tedious, much lesse *painfull vnto death*. Therefore you do very ill to make these partes of Christs Holines to be proper partes of his satisfaction, and the maine Causes of his Agonie and Complaint. And worse you doe if you ascribe them not to any Paines in him at all. Secondly, The summe of these forenoted Texts must be considered: namely that Christe expressly wished sundry times in his dreadfull astonishment suddainly even *against Gods known will* in one respect, though allwayes after his known will in another respect, as afterward wee shall see. And heere are expressed (with his strange *Astonishment*) his mighty *Sorrows*, and *Fears* of them, partly felt and partly further to come. You skip this *Fear* when you reckon but 4. kindes: For this was neither a religious care, nor doubtfull feare, nor desperat nor damned feare, but a right *Naturall feare* in Christ. Which was as I said for the infinitnes of his sorrowes partly now revealed, and partly further to be laid vpon him afterward. Whence also his *sweating drops of blood trickling downe from him*, and his *intolerable Agonie*, and his *comfours receaved by an Angel from heaven* that now in this his wofull

a Before
Sen also
p. 194

b Pag. 97
& 115
2.
c Pag. 98

d Pag. 98

discomfort ministred vnto him: and his complaynig on the Crosse that his Father had forsaken him: finally all his prayers and supplications with teares and strong cries against that death which he feared. Now all these things we see in Christ, came because of his sorowes and Paines in his Passion, not for his zealous Holines and Sanctification. David wated somtime the present feeling of Gods comfortable spirit, and mourned dolefully for the want of it, albeit yet hee were not destitute of his spirit indeed: which also himselfe knew well enough. And thus did Christ even in his greatest plunge of wo: for then he called God *his God* resolutely. Nevertheless, he being infinitely more punished then David, nature could not but suddainly cast out that affection (which yet was meere naturall in him) to with ease, and release of his vnmeasurable and intollerable paines. Third: Adde heere vnto, Christs own expresse words, when in this season he prayeth, that *this Hower* and *This Cup* may passe from him. That which *This Hower* and *This Cup* do signifie, the same is the proper & principall cause of his Agonie. But what can bee meant by *This Hower*, vnles the Paines of his suffering set and appointed by God for him to beare at this determined time from Gods Iustice for sinne? What is *this Cup*, but the bitter tast of the same Paines aforesaid? This I hope was not his Holines and sanctification which so troubled and molested him: not his Piety nor his Pity. Nay, finally he himselfe expresth the true Cause, even his excessive Paines, his overabounding Sorrows and anguish: saying, *My Soule is full of paines or full of sorrows even vnto death*. Heere hee nameth the Cause. For which Cause also, even of intollerable and vnsupportable sorrowes and paines it must needs be that he cryed at his end, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* This then manifestly was the only proper and principall cause of Christes most dreadfull Agonies and perplexity in his Passion, even excessive Paines, and the intire want of feeling of Gods comfort, and nothing els. How hard soever 'twill make it (I know not why) to shew the proper & principall cause thereof. And heere wee will remember againe what is taught by Authority in England. The rather for that you take on as a man impatient, because I doe affirme that our doctrine, (not yours) hath the publike Authorie for it. You call it an *egotistical*, an *insolent and impudent speech*, well becoming an *alchemist*.

151.11.
L.8.

3.

Ioh. 12. 37.
Mark 14. 35

4.

pag. 17.

Item. 1.
pag. 72.

pag. 154.

And yet in the verie next ^b page in plaine termes you graunt ^b Page 1
the same to bee taught in our Homily of Christes Passion: for
you say thus the Hom: teacheth, *The Justice of God pursu-
ed Christe with most paynfull smart and anguish even unto
death: and forced the weaknes of his humane flesh to cry, My God,
my God, why hast thou forsaken me.* Heete I am sure you think not
that our Homelie maketh Christes Pietie or Pitie, nor yet his meere
Bodily paine to force him thus farre. Nor in those wordes next
following there, ^c *O that Mankinds should put the everlasting* ^c Hom
Sonne of God in such paines for the grievousnes of our sinne. And in ^c Pass. 2.
trueth that the Homily is farre from both these your meanings, I
have plainly shewed ^d before. Adde heerevnto the full and large ^d Page 2
declaration heereof in the authorized Catechisme: ^e *Christ suffe-* ^e Name
red not only a common death in sight of men, but also was thorough- ^e teach
ly touched with the horror of eternall death: he fought and wraisted
as it were hand to hand with the whole army of Hell: before Gods
iudgement seat he put him selfe under the heavy and grievous seve-
ritie of Gods punishment: he was driven to most hard straights: he
suffered for us and went through horrible feares, and most bitter sor-
rowes of the minde that he might in all things satisfye the iust iudge-
ment of God & appease his wrath. For to sinners whose person Christ
did heere beare, not only the sorrowes and tormentes of present death
are due, but also of death to come and everlasting: So when hee did
take upon him and beare both the guiltines and iust paine of Man-
kinde damned and lost, he was affected with so grievous feares, iron-
ble and sorrowes of the minde or soule, that he cryed out, My God,
my God, why hast thou forsaken me. Finally the Annotation of our
great ^f Bible authorized and appointed to be read in our Churches, ^f 1501.
iustifyeth all this saying, ^g *Christ here felt the horror of Gods wrath* ^g Anno
and iudgement against sinne. I pray, who is that Egregious lyar ^h Lib. 2.
now? I hope for my part I have spoken the truth in avouching my
doctrine & that forenoted *Transubstantiation* & *Assumption* also, by you
denyed, to be our publike doctrine and fully authorized in En-
gland. Wherefore you may meane some other to be ^h a giddy Spi-
rit lately buzzing in the peoples eares the contrary: I hope I am clear
from it. And thus it remaineth that we conclude even our whole
Reason to be firme & true, which is ⁱ before delivered. *The paines* ⁱ Page
of Christes Passion which now he felt and feared, were the principall

and proper cause of those his Agonies. But his meere Bodily Paine and death, or the feare of them, caused no such things and lamentable effectes in Christ: much lesse did his Pietie and Pitie. Therefore Christ felt and feared Paines more, and infinitely greater, then meere Bodily paine and death: which were the principall and proper Cause of this strange plight in him. Which consequently can be none other by necessary reason, then the Paines and sense of Gods wrath in his spirite properly. Therefore Christ suffered that also: and not only in Body, as you hold.

Howbeit you have yet heere and there some exceptions against this our doctrine which are not to be cleane neglected. First, you say, ^a I extend Ch. istes Agonie too farre: because I will have it proceed from ^b the intollerable sorrowes and horrors of Gods fyrie wrath equall to Hell. I shew not there the Cause of Christes Agonie and Feare; I shewed it of purpose in the ^c beginning. Why did you not refuse that? You ought to have dealt directly against that which I expressly mention to have ben the cause. Thus I said; *His Sorrowes and sufferings for the redemption of sinnes, The Cup of Affliction and sorrowe which now he felt and was to feele yet further, caused him to mourne and feare.* Say then plainly, that this Cause is mistaken, and too farre extended: or els you say nothing to vs, but by indirect and perposterous collection. Now if this Cause which we gave and doe give, be true and right, (as I hope it is before proved more then sufficiently) then I doubt not it is as true also by invincible reason, that Christ suffered the intollerable sorrowes & horrors of Gods fyrie wrath equall to Hell. Which I hope also is fully proved: being the effect of our ^d Assumption before. Seeing it could not be his meere Bodily paines (much lesse his Holy Affections, as you hold) that brought him to this miraculous miserie and distresse, wherein wee see by the Text hee was. Therefore they were the intollerable and incomprehensible dolours of his Spirit (questionles) which wrought the same. There is no other sorrow in the world to be found which can be imagined to be the Cause possibly. And then my other wordes also which ^e heere you cruelly cōdemne, shall stand well enough, ^f That Christ as touching the vehemency of paine was as sharply touched as the Reprobates themselves, yea if it may be more extraordinarily. Though you labour with might and maine to make them amount to Hell.

open blasphemie. But why do you not bend your odious outcries and accusations against that Authority before truly cited, which maintayneth the same so fully and amply as I deliver it? You doe wisely to dissemble your enmitie to all them, and yet nevertheless by me to smite and wounde them. Howbeit what reason have you against our Assertion? Verily onely this you oppose, because *all the sorrowes of the Reprobat are but sinfull guiltines of conscience or feares of iudgement forfene,* which is executed *only in the next life:* you meane onely in the definit and locall Hell. Which yet is no refutation of my assertio, that *Christ was as sharply touched with paine as the very Reprobats.* For though the wicked in this world did never suffer any reall effect of Gods burning wrath working actuall vengeance on their Soules for sinne, but only some guilty remorse or feare and nothing els, yet this letteth not but that Christ whom God ordayned extraordinarily, & alone, to be in this life *a whole and absolute burnt Sacrifice* for all sin, did seele and suffer the same truly, properly, and perfectly. Sec: How I have alwayes expressly excluded from Christ *all sinfull adberets or consequents* in paines and feares, which are in the wicked: and doe resemble his to theirs only and merely *in sharpnes and vehemency of paine,* I have often declared before. Thirdly, the case is cleere enough that the Reprobat many times in this life doe not only feare the iudgment to come, but also do seele some reall and actuall impression of Gods burning wrath, and even of Hell torments, though not being yet in the locall Hell. For prooffe whereof, that which before *I alleaged out of Job, and others,* that even the godly heere want not experience of the sorrowes of Hell sometimes; you passe over answering nothing therevnto. Which yet being so in the godly, it must needes be in Cain, Iudas, and the Reprobats, far more direful & intollerable sometimes. As also their own confession, and behaviour do sundry times testifie in this life: Again the Divells are many times *out of the locall Hell,* as when they are in this world. But the Divells are *never released of Hell sorrows.* Therefore the true sorrowes of Hell are even in this world: and then possibly may be inflicted on wicked men as they are on the Divells which are sometime out of the locall Hell. Lastly the true ioyes of Heaven may be out of the local Heaven: as when the glorious Angels have ben and carryed some while *horne on earth*

a Pag. 179
1921
b Pag. 180

c As being
Extraordinary
ry. suffering
† Likewise
those your
things.
Hell pag. 49.
The Reprobats doe
tyme here
a reall tuff
Hell paines

d Tyme
pag. 48.
e Job 6. 4.
f Ephe. 6.
16. Iam. 3.

g Mat. 8. 12.
13. Ephe.
2. 6. 12.
h 1 Pet. 3. 12.

wild

the Godly
may have a
taste here
of Hea-
venly ioyes.

Cor. 2. 9. 10

1. Pet. 1.

10. 80

1. Pet. 1. 15.

1. Pet. 1. 18.

1. Pet. 1. 18.

1. Pet. 1. 18.

1. Pet. 1. 18.

1. Pet. 1. 18.

1. Pet. 1. 18.

with men. Yet did they never for a moment want the ioyes and glory of Heaven. And if Angells may inioy Heaven really beeing in this world, then is it possible by Gods goodnes to communicate some reall foretaste thereof even vnto some blessed men also. Further that God doth thus indeed ¹ reveale som reall tast of his Heavenly ioyes to his chirdren even in this life, I have ² shewed already, but am not answered. Yea the Transfiguration of Christ on the Mount declareth that some reall part of Heavenly glory may be here on earth, which your selfe ³ somewhere confesseth cleane ⁴ against your self. Only this ⁵ you have to object touching men, that we heere doe but hope and ioyfully beleve. Nowe faith and hope is the ⁶ evidence of thinges not scene: neither are our greatest ioyes the same nor equal to them which we shal possesse in the next world. I answere, our Reasons before doe prove more then onely Hope in the faithfull sometimes. See: It is true the Apostles faith that heere wee walke by faith and live by hope. This is the general state of the godly in this life: also it is spoken in Cōparison of the life to come, which in truth infinitely exceedeth, & lasteth. Yet some rare exceptions doe not overthrow the generall course and heere may be notwithstanding some particular instant time when some reall sense may be revealed to the godly. As there was vnto Christ in the mount, which was to him not onely a ioyfull hope, but a reall tast of his very Heavenly ioyes. Likewise the godly sometime may tast of it in their measure, & yet they may generally in the course of their whole life walke by faith, without the actual sense which I speak of, saving still a most ioyfull remembrance of it. Again, though we are not to doubt but that the reall sense of Heavenly ioyes heere and heerafter are the very same in name (as in the examples before we have scene) yet I say heerafter we shall receive vnspokeable increase farther and above this that we tast heere. 1. When we shall have all darknes & corruption taken from vs, wherewith now we are compassed and clogged all this life long. 2. When the fullnes of Gods appointed time shall come for it, then will he of purpose reveale himselfe and his glory vnto us it were with open face, which heere is don but vnder a vayle: specially then when our bodies also in the Resurrection shall be conioyned with our soules in glorie. 3. When we shall eternally ioy and possesse the same, which heere in this life is but not

then revealed vnto vs in such persons, times, maner, and measure as the Lord shall thinke good. Thus we graunt the ioyes of Heauen heere, are nothing equall to those heereafter: only we say the very same in nature may be and are by the effectuall working of Gods gracious spirit in his elect revealed in some measure, & some time, eue in this world. Neither is this (as your charitie speaketh) any *lewd or wicked error*. Now then if more then *Hope* only, eue Heavenly ioyes may be on earth, surely it followeth; that likewise more then *Fleare*, euen *Hellish paynes* them selues may be in men on earth also, and not in the locall Hell onely. And if *Hell paynes* in this world may be in any, much rather may they haue bene in Christ: whom God purposely sent *through paynes and afflictions* a Hebe. (the extreamest that might be) *to be consecrated the Prince of our saluation*. If you saye, yet thus it will followe that the extreamest paines of Hell are not to be found in this world, as the highest ioyes of Heauen are not likewise, by my confession. Wherefore Christ could not bee so extreamely punished (any thing neare) as the damned be in Hell, no not for any moment: which yet *my conceit* (as you call it) *doeth reach vnto*. I answer, I knowe not, neither meane I to determine the measure and depth of sorrowes which Christ in his Passion suffered: as also it is not possible to define that glorie which hee tasted of (for the time) in the mount. Only graunt this plainly, that Christ suffered in his soule the true effects of Gods proper Iustice or wrath: and we seeke no more. Graunt this I say, and then we will see further (if you will make it a question) whether the sense of payne in Christ was lesser for the time, then that which is eternall in the damned: and whether the true and proper wrath of God taking full vengeance of sinne heere in this world, might not be as sharpe and violent as the sharpest torment in Hell, yea the very shame which is in Hell the sharpest. Truly, though Christ suffered all (which hee did suffer) heere in this world, yet for any thing I can see, there is cause why Christ should be an Extraordinarie person in the case of Suffering for sinne in this life: and that therefore, as touching sorrow and paine, he might feele more then ever any els hath or could feele for the time. You seeme to graunt vnto Christ *b all naturall sorrowes* and *b paynes*. Neither doe wee seeke any more. But *you trust the paynes of the Damned is more then a naturall oppressing and afflicting of the* b Pag.

heart with humane feare & sorrow. Forsooth it is not. It is no more then a very natural humane sorrow & feare. It proceedeth immediately and principally from God him selfe: who is the *Nature of natures*. Also *Humane nature* is apt to receyue such sorrow & fear from him. Thus the very paynes of the Damned are meereley naturall. Yet *supernaturall* I graunt they are, if we meane this, that they are aboute our natures state to beare or to cōprehend them. This therefore hitherto is a very slight exception against our doctrine before delivered.

pag. 296.

creat. 1.

ps. 50.

mark. 14. 35

job. 12. 27.

The next is as vaine, where ^a you thinke it not tolerable that I say, Christ ^b in playne words prayed contrary to Gods knowne will. I pray haue patience: I saye no harme, nor meane no ill. Did not Christ in plaine wordes pray, *That, if it were possible this Hower might passe from him:* and before, *Father, save me frō this hower.* By this *Hower* he meaneth this his paine & punishment appointed him by God for to suffer at that time. And this Christe knew well, seeing he saith presently, *But therefore I came into this hower.* Doeth he not then pray in plaine words cōtrary to Gods knowne will? Therefore never skoffe at it, nor reproch it, nor wrest it. We ought not to bee ashamed to acknowledge that weaknes of Humane nature in Christ, which Christ was not ashamed of for our sakes to vndergo. If this could not be possibly in Christes Manhood without sin, then I were a wretch to affirme so much of him; especially stil to affirm it. But if it be possible by any means, thorow the meere instinct of mans Nature, (as it is Gods creatur and free from all sinne) thus to speake and to wish suddainly, and suddainly to controll it againe, as Christ did: then what minde beare you, and how may we iudge of this your striving, which is not to cleare Christ from all sinne in his Agonie. For that we doe all, and Nature it selfe witnesseth with vs that in such a case as he now was in, this was nothing strang to be thus perplexed, & moved. But your striving seemeth to be altogether to exempt Christ-man from our meere naturall affections and infirmities: and to give him Humane flesh indeed, but not such as ours is in all and every point, except onely sinne. You will say, If hee knew it to be Gods will and prayed against it, how could he want sinne? I answer, He knew it; but at this instar he cōsidered it not, he thought not on it: and so his suddaine desire may bee cleere from sinne. But why thought hee not on it? or how could hee choose but

think

think on that which he well knew, and did so greatly concerne him? I answer, His Paines and sorrowes being so great and so infinit as they were, not in his Body onely but chiefly in his very Spirit and Minde, and these more extreamely revealed vpon him now at these instant times, then they were otherwise or continually, as by the effects of them in him we may perceave. I say, these things acknowledged & wel wayghed as they ought to be, then it is ealy to shew *why*, & *how* Christ came thus affected, & yet without sin. First, he was now *astonished* as the text saith: and you acknowledge that he might be. See: these incōprehensible sorrowes & incomparable paines *astonished* him: yea impossible it was but his meere humane nature must be *astonished* with them. And it is utterly vntrue which you say, *Many things might astonish our Saviour for the time besides such paines*. In these instant times of his Passion, nothing could astonish him but *Paines and Sorrowes*. Wch before^d I have proved, or at least that *Paines & Sorrowes* now did chiefly: & that nothing could possibly without such *Sorrowes* and *Paines* as these, which I speake of: even spirituall, and infinit, and incomprehensible paines, proceeding from Gods Iustice vpon him for our sinnes. Thirdly, Adde heerevnto that which you rightly graunt, *It is true that a mighty feare may so affect a man for the time, that it shall hinder the senses from recovering themselves, and stop the faculties from informing one the other. But this must be some suddain obiect astonishing the heart, and so terrible, that it suffereth vs not presently to gather our wits together, and to consider of it*. Likewise very fully afterward, *Astonishment draweth the minde so wholly to think on some speciall thing above our reach, that during the time we turne not our selues to any other cogitation*. Even as the eye, if it be bent intently to behold any thing, for that present it discerneth nothing els: So saith it with the Soule, if she wholly addiect her selfe to think on any matter, she is amused; if it be more than she conceaveth, or more fearfull then she well indureth, she is amazed or *astonished*: but not of necessity so, that she loseth either sense or memorie: only for that time she converteth neither to any other obiect. Now thus Christ being *astonished* with sorrowes and feare lost not either *sense, memory, or understanding*, much lesse his vertues and graces, being cast into an infernall confusion, as you vntruly & charg me that I say. But I say,

a Ekthamb
isthai, is to
astonished
feare. Mar. 14.

33.
b Pag. 124.
c Pag. 196.

d Pa. 115.

e Pag. 120.

f Pag. 197.

g Pag. 129.

as you say, He now on the suddaine might turne neither *sense nor memory to any other object*, and so not think on any thing els, but only on this *terrible and mighty sorrow & feare*, which now smote him & bruized him to pieces. And thus for the very suddaine he might not think at all vpon Gods will, and his owne certaine purpose to suffer this very same, or that he was to suffer it longer: but only on the intolerableness of the paines and wo, which instantly he felt. Now Natures very instinct is, in such dolours to wish and desire ease, and the more vehemently it is pinched, the more earnestly it desireth: and this is Gods owne gift and workmanship in nature, and simply thus to desire, is in this respect truly to be reckoned Gods owne expresse will. And thus for the suddaine *not remembring, nor thinking* on Gods particular will otherwise, but feeling the instinct of nature in such a case only wishing ease to it self, he prayeth rightly *That this Hower & This Cup might passe fro him*. Wherein yet I say he prayeth in one respect against Gods known wil, but in an other respect even according to his will. According to his wil which now he had sense of, even to wish release & ease fro such *deadly sorrows and feare*: contrary to his particular wil being this that he must yet further suffer them. Which (as I said) suddenly being astonished he remembred not, he thought not vpon it. Lastly it was contrary in the outward words, & in the particular affection of his minde *now wanting this remembrance*: but it was fully and wholly according to Gods will in the generall disposition of his minde and whole man. As appeared by his present applying himselfe with all readines even to this most dolorous obedience of Gods will, forthwith so soone as hee recollected himself: saying *Not my will, but thy will be don*. Where even this also sheweth, that before Gods will and his in some respect were contrary, but absolutely now they agree. If you abhorre this in me, yet see what Chrysostom taught, *These wordes (Not as I Will, but as thou wilt) do signifie 2. Wills, (saith he) one of the Father another of the Sonne, contrary the one to the other*. I graunt M. Beuileth som termes differing from ours, yet his sense is the selfsame with ours. He said *Christ corrected not his speech as if he had before spoken amisse*. I say, He did correct his speech: not mending it being any whit amisse, but making it being good to be better. That by shewing his generall conformitie to Gods will now more particu-

Ioan Con-
stantinop. in
Theodoret.
Dial. 3.
Bez. Annot.
mat. 26.

Early, and distinctly. Which sentences in effect and indeed do not differ: and this latter, I think, may well be called *correcting*, no lesse then the former. Also he saith, The Humane and Divine will are *not Contrary, but Divers*. I vnderstand *even Differing from Gods will, to be Contrary*. Namely in that particular respect wherein the difference is. For otherwise now there may be a general perfect conformance to Gods will, as is before said. Neither is this particular contrariety to Gods will any sinne, namely when by Gods own ordinance we know not what Gods special will is, so that we alwayes remaine apt & ready therevnto when we know it. So did David desire the life of his Child. It was contrary to Gods wil one way: as the event shewed, for the Child dyed. Yet he prayed well and rightly according to God will in natures affection, seeing hee knew not Gods secret will to the contrary; neither was to have knowne it before the event. And thus likewise stood the case with Christe at this season. His suddaine *Not remembering* Gods particular will (by reason of his fearfull astonishment) was all one as if he had not known it at all (yea thus also he ought not to haue knowen it) for that instant. Namely, seeing this *Not remembering* and *not thinking* thereon came not of any negligence or default in him, but only and meere by Natures infirmities (Gods own ordinance) which could not possibly but faile vnder such infinit violence of paines. This M. Beza calleth *Divers* rather then *Contrarie* to Gods will: but in effect it is the same, and he plainly meaneth even there all one with vs. You say *I am captiuus against Christ* in not supplying one Evangelist with another. For so Christes desire wil appeare to be but *Conditionall*, therefore not *Contrary* to Gods will. Yes, nevertheless, as touching the desire it selfe and his particular present inclination compared to Gods particular determination heerein. And so was also Davids forenoted desire for his childs life: yea Balaams bad desire was such in this point. These were all *Conditionall*, yet contrarie to Gods particular will. Heerein stood the difference: Balaam then knewe Gods will was otherwise, at that tyme when he inclined after his owne minde. David simply knew not, Christ also knew not (that is, he remembered not) at that instant the contrary. Therefore Balaams desire though *Conditionall* and with reservation (as it seemed) of God will, was nevertheless wicked and against God: his

* 2 Sam. 16.

* Page

* Num. 19.

conditionall words excused not the opposition of his Will against
 Gods Wil. Yea, in this case when we perfectly know and remember
 Gods certaine will, every light affection and suddaine wishing to
 the contrary, (howsoever conditionally) is no lesse then manifest
 sinne against God. But in David and Christ heere the case is not
 so, as before I noted. Their desires indeed were, & ought to have
 ben conditionall: for who knoweth not, that all good prayers and
 desires for temporall things must bee conditionall, that is with re-
 servation of Gods Will alwayes implied, though not alwayes ex-
 pressed? And albeit they were conditionall yet they might be and
 were contrary, as also I have shewed. Yea the very nature of all
 Conditional desires is such, that it includeth evermore a possibili-
 ty (at least) of being contrary to his wil, whom we desire. And there-
 fore we vse sometime expressly to qualifie our desire, saying, *If thou*
wilt, and if it please thee, &c. Now thus was Davids and Christs
 yea not only possible to be contrary, but contrary indeede, as the
 sequelle shewed. Howbeit both their desires were nevertheless
 holy, *made in faith, assured to receive,* (as conditional desires may
 be) *directed aright, prepared sufficiently:* yet onely for this cause,
 seeing David simply knew not Gods contrary wil: Christ knew it
 not at that instant. Howbeit the truth is, Christ could not but
 now know and remember it very well, if hee were not at this in-
 stant grievously astonished. Neither could he be so astonished
 and wofully distressed in his Soule, without that intolerable
 and infinit waight of sorrowes before spoken of. Therefore
 briefly, so it was doubtlesse with him at that season. All in vaine
 then you charge mee that I *stretch the Scriptures beyond their*
wordes and the truth, when in my discourse I shew that Christ
 in the garden was *astonished & grievously perplexed:* the text ha-
 ving onely, *He began to be astonished and grievously perplexed.* I
 graunt the text is so. But thinke you, that phrase in Scripture sig-
 nieth a begging only, & no further proceeding at all? It is writ-
 ten, *He began to teach them many things.* Also, *And Iesus an-*
swered them and began to say, Take heede least any man deceive
you, &c. And *He began to cast out them that sold in the Temple,*
&c. And *All that which Iesus began to doe and teach.* And, *Ter-*
tullus began to accuse Paul, saying, &c. It were very simple to
 say that the Scripture meaneth these things were only begun, and

g. 398.

g. 399.

Mat. 23. 34.

Mat. 23. 35.

Mat. 23. 45.

Mat. 23. 46.

Mat. 23. 47.

no more. Nay verily, they were heere, don to the full. Again, as Christ was indeed astonished & grievously perplexed, so he did at the first but *begin* to be thus, and then afterwards grew to the full. Now these degrees and proceedings of Christ in his sorrowes, & that they were not at the highest at once, this worde heere *be began* may very well signifie. For the text following doth invincibly shew that he did fully come to the extremitie of astonishment, & *began not only*. For did he but *begin* when hee sweet clooded blood trickling from his body to the ground? Also when an Angell was sent from Heaven to refresh and comfort him: did he then but *begin* to be heavy? Again, when most moornfully he complained that his Soule abounded with sorrowes even unto death: Finally when he 3. severall tymes prayed to his Father with strong crying, tears, and fcare, that the Cup of Gods punishments now given him to drinke, might passe from him if it were possible, which at other tymes he most perfectly knew that it neyther could nor should escape him: wherevnto may be added that at last when he so dolefully complayned that his God had *forsaken him*; was hee now all this while but *beginning* to be troubled and sad? You would have mademe ashamed of it, if I had had any such thought in my minde. Wherefore the text is no way abused as you pretend in that after *be began*, I shew fro these places that he grew to be mightily astonished & grievously perplexed. As for Ierom, if he deny this, I must crave leave to dissent from him. I bring (you say) "*a fardell*" of phrases to expresse his Agonie, he was *amazed, astonished, forgetfull, distempered, overwhelmed, and all confounded in the pannes of his soule, and senses of his body*? Yea, and I thinke all too little sufficiently to expresse our Lords sufferings for vs. All those words wh^{ch} I vsed and many mo cannot shew all that unspeakeable vehemency of Sorrow, which now cast him into such a plight. So far of it is, that "*I do the Lord of glory wrong*: when I labour but to shew how he loved vs, and to what basenes of our nature he submitted him self for our sake. For al these are but meere effects of natures infirmie, if it be oppressed with any infinit sorrow & fcare. Seeing then Christ might be and was now thus infinitely afflicted (as we have shewed) why should we feare to acknowledge extreme Effectes in him, where we have extreme Causes. Nay, God forbid that we should reioyce in any thing so much, neither can wee

praise

Ekénôle
Philip. 2. 7.

alv in
lath. 26.

Mat. 1. pa. 57

Pag. 199.

Pag. 120.

Pag. 121.

Pag. 193.

Chro. 1. 12

Mat. 27

Pag. 100.

praise, & magnify him for any thing so highly, as we may & ought for this extreame ^{abasing} of Christe for vs. Remember your owne wordes out of Austin: that there is in som men *Insuperbia*, a fond intent of honoring Christ. If there be any such, surely this is one point thereof which you maintaine. M^r Calvin, a worthy Minister of Christ, and a pillar of the Church, is bolde and saith: *Fatemur cerie hanc esse crucis stultitiam qua scandalum est superbis hominibus.* We confesse indeed such is the basenes and folly of Christes Crosse; that proud men cannot away with it. In another place where I shewed from the more to the lesse, howe Christe might have (for the suddain) the powers of his minde astonished, and yet no decay in him of faith, nor of obedience, nor of patience, nor of loue; like as there is not in a man benumbed & bound in his senses more then Christ was; namely in a man a sleepe or amazed with a violent blow on the head. For thus any reasonable man would haue conceaved me: seeing who would imagine that I thought Christ now to be altogether so without sense as one that sleepeth or that lyeth in a swoone? Heerevpon you aske me skoffingly, ^a Was Christ a sleepe, or in a swoone? ^b cast into a trauince, or ^c in a fit of a Lethargie. But what I doe thinke of Christs Agonie I haue said before. Indeed, as ^d you grant that Amazednes and Astonishment commeth naturally from sorrows and feares: and that, both in these causes and effects there be diuers degrees: so I thinke in Christ both the one and the other was in the extreamest and most violent degree that might be. And therefore no marvaile though his Astonishment were far greater, then to be seene in any man els that ever was or shalbee. The Lord made Solomon to excell all others in ^e wisdom, and riches, and treasures, and honour, so, that there hath not ben the like among the Kings which were before him; neither after him shall there bee the like. Of Christ (I iudge) we may altogether as truly and as fully say, that the Lord made him so subiect to infirmities & to suffering of sorrows that there hath not ben the like among men which were before him; neither after him shall there be the like. And yet none of those your former imputations are true. But ^f for my life I cannot answer this that followeth, *All that Christ suffered was and may be meritorious with God.* The suffering of Hell paines which ^g should and should haue ^h should haue ⁱ should haue ^j should haue ^k should haue ^l should haue ^m should haue ⁿ should haue ^o should haue ^p should haue ^q should haue ^r should haue ^s should haue ^t should haue ^u should haue ^v should haue ^w should haue ^x should haue ^y should haue ^z should haue ^{aa} should haue ^{ab} should haue ^{ac} should haue ^{ad} should haue ^{ae} should haue ^{af} should haue ^{ag} should haue ^{ah} should haue ^{ai} should haue ^{aj} should haue ^{ak} should haue ^{al} should haue ^{am} should haue ^{an} should haue ^{ao} should haue ^{ap} should haue ^{aq} should haue ^{ar} should haue ^{as} should haue ^{at} should haue ^{au} should haue ^{av} should haue ^{aw} should haue ^{ax} should haue ^{ay} should haue ^{az} should haue ^{ba} should haue ^{bb} should haue ^{bc} should haue ^{bd} should haue ^{be} should haue ^{bf} should haue ^{bg} should haue ^{bh} should haue ^{bi} should haue ^{bj} should haue ^{bk} should haue ^{bl} should haue ^{bm} should haue ^{bn} should haue ^{bo} should haue ^{bp} should haue ^{bq} should haue ^{br} should haue ^{bs} should haue ^{bt} should haue ^{bu} should haue ^{bv} should haue ^{bw} should haue ^{bx} should haue ^{by} should haue ^{bz} should haue ^{ca} should haue ^{cb} should haue ^{cc} should haue ^{cd} should haue ^{ce} should haue ^{cf} should haue ^{cg} should haue ^{ch} should haue ^{ci} should haue ^{cj} should haue ^{ck} should haue ^{cl} should haue ^{cm} should haue ^{cn} should haue ^{co} should haue ^{cp} should haue ^{cq} should haue ^{cr} should haue ^{cs} should haue ^{ct} should haue ^{cu} should haue ^{cv} should haue ^{cw} should haue ^{cx} should haue ^{cy} should haue ^{cz} should haue ^{da} should haue ^{db} should haue ^{dc} should haue ^{dd} should haue ^{de} should haue ^{df} should haue ^{dg} should haue ^{dh} should haue ^{di} should haue ^{dj} should haue ^{dk} should haue ^{dl} should haue ^{dm} should haue ^{dn} should haue ^{do} should haue ^{dp} should haue ^{dq} should haue ^{dr} should haue ^{ds} should haue ^{dt} should haue ^{du} should haue ^{dv} should haue ^{dw} should haue ^{dx} should haue ^{dy} should haue ^{dz} should haue ^{ea} should haue ^{eb} should haue ^{ec} should haue ^{ed} should haue ^{ee} should haue ^{ef} should haue ^{eg} should haue ^{eh} should haue ^{ei} should haue ^{ej} should haue ^{ek} should haue ^{el} should haue ^{em} should haue ^{en} should haue ^{eo} should haue ^{ep} should haue ^{eq} should haue ^{er} should haue ^{es} should haue ^{et} should haue ^{eu} should haue ^{ev} should haue ^{ew} should haue ^{ex} should haue ^{ey} should haue ^{ez} should haue ^{fa} should haue ^{fb} should haue ^{fc} should haue ^{fd} should haue ^{fe} should haue ^{ff} should haue ^{fg} should haue ^{fh} should haue ^{fi} should haue ^{fj} should haue ^{fk} should haue ^{fl} should haue ^{fm} should haue ^{fn} should haue ^{fo} should haue ^{fp} should haue ^{fq} should haue ^{fr} should haue ^{fs} should haue ^{ft} should haue ^{fu} should haue ^{fv} should haue ^{fw} should haue ^{fx} should haue ^{fy} should haue ^{fz} should haue ^{ga} should haue ^{gb} should haue ^{gc} should haue ^{gd} should haue ^{ge} should haue ^{gf} should haue ^{gg} should haue ^{gh} should haue ^{gi} should haue ^{gj} should haue ^{gk} should haue ^{gl} should haue ^{gm} should haue ^{gn} should haue ^{go} should haue ^{gp} should haue ^{gq} should haue ^{gr} should haue ^{gs} should haue ^{gt} should haue ^{gu} should haue ^{gv} should haue ^{gw} should haue ^{gx} should haue ^{gy} should haue ^{gz} should haue ^{ha} should haue ^{hb} should haue ^{hc} should haue ^{hd} should haue ^{he} should haue ^{hf} should haue ^{hg} should haue ^{hh} should haue ^{hi} should haue ^{hj} should haue ^{hk} should haue ^{hl} should haue ^{hm} should haue ^{hn} should haue ^{ho} should haue ^{hp} should haue ^{hq} should haue ^{hr} should haue ^{hs} should haue ^{ht} should haue ^{hu} should haue ^{hv} should haue ^{hw} should haue ^{hx} should haue ^{hy} should haue ^{hz} should haue ^{ia} should haue ^{ib} should haue ^{ic} should haue ^{id} should haue ^{ie} should haue ^{if} should haue ^{ig} should haue ^{ih} should haue ⁱⁱ should haue ^{ij} should haue ^{ik} should haue ^{il} should haue ^{im} should haue ⁱⁿ should haue ^{io} should haue ^{ip} should haue ^{iq} should haue ^{ir} should haue ^{is} should haue ^{it} should haue ^{iu} should haue ^{iv} should haue ^{iw} should haue ^{ix} should haue ^{iy} should haue ^{iz} should haue ^{ja} should haue ^{jb} should haue ^{jc} should haue ^{jd} should haue ^{je} should haue ^{jf} should haue ^{jj} should haue ^{jh} should haue ^{ji} should haue ^{jj} should haue ^{jk} should haue ^{jl} should haue ^{jm} should haue ^{jn} should haue ^{jo} should haue ^{jp} should haue ^{jq} should haue ^{jr} should haue ^{js} should haue ^{jt} should haue ^{ju} should haue ^{jv} should haue ^{jw} should haue ^{jx} should haue ^{jy} should haue ^{jz} should haue ^{ka} should haue ^{kb} should haue ^{kc} should haue ^{kd} should haue ^{ke} should haue ^{kf} should haue ^{kg} should haue ^{kh} should haue ^{ki} should haue ^{kj} should haue ^{kk} should haue ^{kl} should haue ^{km} should haue ^{kn} should haue ^{ko} should haue ^{kp} should haue ^{kq} should haue ^{kr} should haue ^{ks} should haue ^{kt} should haue ^{ku} should haue ^{kv} should haue ^{kw} should haue ^{kx} should haue ^{ky} should haue ^{kz} should haue ^{la} should haue ^{lb} should haue ^{lc} should haue ^{ld} should haue ^{le} should haue ^{lf} should haue ^{lg} should haue ^{lh} should haue ^{li} should haue ^{lj} should haue ^{lk} should haue ^{ll} should haue ^{lm} should haue ^{ln} should haue ^{lo} should haue ^{lp} should haue ^{lq} should haue ^{lr} should haue ^{ls} should haue ^{lt} should haue ^{lu} should haue ^{lv} should haue ^{lw} should haue ^{lx} should haue ^{ly} should haue ^{lz} should haue ^{ma} should haue ^{mb} should haue ^{mc} should haue ^{md} should haue ^{me} should haue ^{mf} should haue ^{mg} should haue ^{mh} should haue ^{mi} should haue ^{mj} should haue ^{mk} should haue ^{ml} should haue ^{mm} should haue ^{mn} should haue ^{mo} should haue ^{mp} should haue ^{mq} should haue ^{mr} should haue ^{ms} should haue ^{mt} should haue ^{mu} should haue ^{mv} should haue ^{mw} should haue ^{mx} should haue ^{my} should haue ^{mz} should haue ^{na} should haue ^{nb} should haue ^{nc} should haue nd should haue ^{ne} should haue ^{nf} should haue ^{ng} should haue ^{nh} should haue ⁿⁱ should haue ^{nj} should haue ^{nk} should haue ^{nl} should haue ^{nm} should haue ⁿⁿ should haue ^{no} should haue ^{np} should haue ^{nq} should haue ^{nr} should haue ^{ns} should haue ^{nt} should haue ^{nu} should haue ^{nv} should haue ^{nw} should haue ^{nx} should haue ^{ny} should haue ^{nz} should haue ^{oa} should haue ^{ob} should haue ^{oc} should haue ^{od} should haue ^{oe} should haue ^{of} should haue ^{og} should haue ^{oh} should haue ^{oi} should haue ^{oj} should haue ^{ok} should haue ^{ol} should haue ^{om} should haue ^{on} should haue ^{oo} should haue ^{op} should haue ^{oq} should haue ^{or} should haue ^{os} should haue ^{ot} should haue ^{ou} should haue ^{ov} should haue ^{ow} should haue ^{ox} should haue ^{oy} should haue ^{oz} should haue ^{pa} should haue ^{pb} should haue ^{pc} should haue ^{pd} should haue ^{pe} should haue ^{pf} should haue ^{pg} should haue ^{ph} should haue ^{pi} should haue ^{pj} should haue ^{pk} should haue ^{pl} should haue ^{pm} should haue ^{pn} should haue ^{po} should haue ^{pp} should haue ^{pq} should haue ^{pr} should haue ^{ps} should haue ^{pt} should haue ^{pu} should haue ^{pv} should haue ^{pw} should haue ^{px} should haue ^{py} should haue ^{pz} should haue ^{qa} should haue ^{qb} should haue ^{qc} should haue ^{qd} should haue ^{qe} should haue ^{qf} should haue ^{qg} should haue ^{qh} should haue ^{qi} should haue ^{qj} should haue ^{qk} should haue ^{ql} should haue ^{qm} should haue ^{qn} should haue ^{qo} should haue ^{qp} should haue ^{qq} should haue ^{qr} should haue ^{qs} should haue ^{qt} should haue ^{qu} should haue ^{qv} should haue ^{qw} should haue ^{qx} should haue ^{qy} should haue ^{qz} should haue ^{ra} should haue ^{rb} should haue ^{rc} should haue rd should haue ^{re} should haue ^{rf} should haue ^{rg} should haue ^{rh} should haue ^{ri} should haue ^{rj} should haue ^{rk} should haue ^{rl} should haue ^{rm} should haue ^{rn} should haue ^{ro} should haue ^{rp} should haue ^{rq} should haue ^{rr} should haue ^{rs} should haue ^{rt} should haue ^{ru} should haue ^{rv} should haue ^{rw} should haue ^{rx} should haue ^{ry} should haue ^{rz} should haue ^{sa} should haue ^{sb} should haue ^{sc} should haue ^{sd} should haue ^{se} should haue ^{sf} should haue ^{sg} should haue ^{sh} should haue ^{si} should haue ^{sj} should haue ^{sk} should haue ^{sl} should haue sm should haue ^{sn} should haue ^{so} should haue ^{sp} should haue ^{sq} should haue ^{sr} should haue ^{ss} should haue st should haue ^{su} should haue ^{sv} should haue ^{sw} should haue ^{sx} should haue ^{sy} should haue ^{sz} should haue ^{ta} should haue ^{tb} should haue ^{tc} should haue ^{td} should haue ^{te} should haue ^{tf} should haue ^{tg} should haue th should haue ^{ti} should haue ^{tj} should haue ^{tk} should haue ^{tl} should haue tm should haue ^{tn} should haue ^{to} should haue ^{tp} should haue ^{tq} should haue ^{tr} should haue ^{ts} should haue ^{tt} should haue ^{tu} should haue ^{tv} should haue ^{tw} should haue ^{tx} should haue ^{ty} should haue ^{tz} should haue ^{ua} should haue ^{ub} should haue ^{uc} should haue ^{ud} should haue ^{ue} should haue ^{uf} should haue ^{ug} should haue ^{uh} should haue ^{ui} should haue ^{uj} should haue ^{uk} should haue ^{ul} should haue ^{um} should haue ^{un} should haue ^{uo} should haue ^{up} should haue ^{uq} should haue ^{ur} should haue ^{us} should haue ^{ut} should haue ^{uu} should haue ^{uv} should haue ^{uw} should haue ^{ux} should haue ^{uy} should haue ^{uz} should haue ^{va} should haue ^{vb} should haue ^{vc} should haue ^{vd} should haue ^{ve} should haue ^{vf} should haue ^{vg} should haue ^{vh} should haue ^{vi} should haue ^{vj} should haue ^{vk} should haue ^{vl} should haue ^{vm} should haue ^{vn} should haue ^{vo} should haue ^{vp} should haue ^{vq} should haue ^{vr} should haue ^{vs} should haue ^{vt} should haue ^{vu} should haue ^{vv} should haue ^{vw} should haue ^{vx} should haue ^{vy} should haue ^{vz} should haue ^{wa} should haue ^{wb} should haue ^{wc} should haue ^{wd} should haue ^{we} should haue ^{wf} should haue ^{wg} should haue ^{wh} should haue ^{wi} should haue ^{wj} should haue ^{wk} should haue ^{wl} should haue ^{wm} should haue ^{wn} should haue ^{wo} should haue ^{wp} should haue ^{wq} should haue ^{wr} should haue ^{ws} should haue ^{wt} should haue ^{wu} should haue ^{wv} should haue ^{ww} should haue ^{wx} should haue ^{wy} should haue ^{wz} should haue ^{xa} should haue ^{xb} should haue ^{xc} should haue ^{xd} should haue ^{xe} should haue ^{xf} should haue ^{xg} should haue ^{xh} should haue ^{xi} should haue ^{xj} should haue ^{xk} should haue ^{xl} should haue ^{xm} should haue ^{xn} should haue ^{xo} should haue ^{xp} should haue ^{xq} should haue ^{xr} should haue ^{xs} should haue ^{xt} should haue ^{xu} should haue ^{xv} should haue ^{xw} should haue ^{xx} should haue ^{xy} should haue ^{xz} should haue ^{ya} should haue ^{yb} should haue ^{yc} should haue ^{yd} should haue ^{ye} should haue ^{yf} should haue ^{yg} should haue ^{yh} should haue ^{yi} should haue ^{yj} should haue ^{yk} should haue ^{yl} should haue ^{ym} should haue ^{yn} should haue ^{yo} should haue ^{yp} should haue ^{yq} should haue ^{yr} should haue ^{ys} should haue ^{yt} should haue ^{yu} should haue ^{yv} should haue ^{yw} should haue ^{yx} should haue ^{yy} should haue ^{yz} should haue ^{za} should haue ^{zb} should haue ^{zc} should haue ^{zd} should haue ^{ze} should haue ^{zf} should haue ^{zg} should haue ^{zh} should haue ^{zi} should haue ^{zj} should haue ^{zk} should haue ^{zl} should haue ^{zm} should haue ^{zn} should haue ^{zo} should haue ^{zp} should haue ^{zq} should haue ^{zr} should haue ^{zs} should haue ^{zt} should haue ^{zu} should haue ^{zv} should haue ^{zw} should haue ^{zx} should haue ^{zy} should haue ^{zz}

Body, neither was, nor could be meritorious with God. Therefore Christ suffered not such paines as did astonish and confound his bodily senses, and powers of his Soule. I deny your Assumption. Not only all Christs paines were meritorious, but even all his very infirmities also: his wearines, his hunger, his sleepe, and so his astonishment & amazednes (being in him but a meere natural weaknes and infirmity) was exceeding meritorious in him and highly accepted with God. Man hath his meere infirmities all agreeable to Gods will: but Christ directly and properly glorified God in and by them more then can bee vttered, I say, in every point whatsoever of his Humane infirmity and basenes, wherevnto hee humbled himselfe. If it seeme a hard phrase which in my former Treatise I vsed, saying Christ at this instant became *forgetfull* of that which before he knew: my meaning is (and so still I speake now) *he remembred not, he considered not*. Which many times wee vse to name *forgetting*: but indeed strictly and properly it is rather *not remembring*. Where you would ^hwring out a contrariety in my wordes, as if I had said: That Christ being in the depth of his astonishment did then perfittly know that the dominion of death should not hold him: you doe mee wrong, I say not so. In that place I argue from your suppositiō, that if Christ were now not astonished, but in his perfitt memory and full considering of such thinges (as you seeme to affirme, but I deny) which otherwise hee knew well, then it could not be the Dominion of death that hee thus feared, sith in his firme estate he knew perfittly that it should not prevaile over him. To conclude this matter: thus we may see how without colour of reason ⁱyou wrest a plaine text, which otherwise taken (as it lyeth) maketh strongly against you. They are our Saviours Christs owne words, ^k*Now is my soule troubled: & what shall I say? Father save me from this howe: but therefore came I vnto this howe*. You say these words do import a Deliberation of 2. partes. But you speak against all reason, considering the nature and frame of the very words. A Deliberation must needes bee set interrogatively in both clauses, thus: *what shall I say? Father, save me from this howe?* Now the text is not so: it pretendeth a plaine resolution, or at least a great inclining toward resolution, thus: *Father, save me frō this howe*. It can not be a Deliberation. Chrysostom and Epiphanius do descant about it, trying how the

h Pag. 296

i Pag. 297

k Ioh. 12

Chryſoſt.
lib; Licet
turbatio
dicere co-
(ſerva me
) contrari-
tamen
ſco.
loh. 12. 31.
3. 33. & all
others hee-
pon.

Treat. 1. pa.
3. 63.

Pa. 22. 23.
20, &c

ag. 23.
ag. 204.
ag. 23. 24.

ag. 305.

text may beare ſuch a meaning: but it cannot ſtand being ſo evi-
dently againſt the courſe of the text. You ſay, *S. Iohn heere ſea-
keth of another time and place.* What then? Yet he may ſpeake of
the ſame matter, namely of his Paſſion, or of a Foretaſt thereof.
Which indeed the text it ſelfe ^m ſheweth that he did ſpeake of.
Wherefore neither can we deny, but this place of Scripture (even
as the other about his Praying in the Garden) doth ſurely con-
firme that his Paſſion was more then *meere bodily*, which did ſo
miraculouſly terrifie him. It could be no leſſe then the paines of
the infinit wrath of God vpon his Soule. Hence alſo I reaſoned ef-
fectually ⁿ before, but no where you anſwer it; If Chriſts ſuch ſuf-
feringes in his Soule were ordayned of God for him, then moſt
certainly indeede he did ſuffer theſame. Nowe we ſee ſuch ſuf-
ferings were ordained for him: ſeeing he ſaith, *but therefore came I
vnto this bower.* Therefore moſt certainly indeed hee did ſuffer
them, at one time or other.

Yet further you except, where you avouch that this was ^a *Fear*
of *Eternall death* and *Euerlaſting damnation* which cauſed in
Chriſt this Agonie: *and from his feare he was deliuered.* Ergo, *he
ſuffered not that which he feared.* Firſt I graunt indeed this was the
2. *Death, the death of the ſoule, or Hell tormentes* which Chriſt
heere ^b feared: neither can this by any meanes be denied, as anon
we ſhall ſee. Howbeit to ſay (as you do) that it was *Eternall death*
and *Euerlaſting malediction* which heere Chriſt thus woefully &
diſtreſfully feared, is the ſtrangeſt ſpeech in Divinitie that ever I
heard. Sec: you can not helpe youe ſelfe in making Chriſtes fear
of *this Death* to be onely a ^c *religious feare*, & ^d *a feare for others.*
Theſe imaginations I haue removed ^e before. Every Reader will
easily ſee in his owne indgemēt that theſe affections ſo vehement
were not likely at this ſeaſon, nor likely in him at all, much leſſe
likely to be Cauſes of ſuch Effectes. Againe theſe are not *Fears*
properly: they ought rather to bee called (as they are) a *religious
care, Commiſeration and pitie.* Which differ greatly from the na-
ture of *Feare* properly taken, ſuch as we ought to conceave in this
place. You thinke the ^f nature of *enlavia* will not admit any pro-
per *Feare*, & namely no *perplexed Feare*, as I take it heere to ſig-
nifie: but a *carefull & diligēt regard to bowe and decline that
which we miſlike or doubt.* What ſay you? Did Chriſt doubt *En-*

nall Damnation, and therefore *Feared* it? you speak so darklie,
 that I know not how to take you. But it may be you meane hee
 him selfe *mislaked* it only, and was sorry for others who ran head-
 long into it. But all this still is nothing els save *Piety* in him pro-
 perlie: yea and so you say *this cometh nearest to the signification of*
the Greek word. I graunt it doeth touching *Eulabia*: but in Mark
 the ^a word doth import properly *Feare*, and that in extreamitie.
 Againe touching *Eulabia*; my reason that heere it signifieth *Feare*
 properly, yea a *perplexed feare*, and not not only a *religious devo-*
tion as you say, is grouded not so much on the nature of the word,
 as on the Circumstances and the other words of this Text: *Christ*
in the dayes of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications with
strong crying and teares vnto him that was able to save him from
Death, and was heard in that which he feared. Heere these other
 words doe shewe that this *Feare* was more then a *carefull regard*
 to beware that which he *mislaked*: it was no lesse in deed then a *per-*
plexed and troubled feare wofully dreading that which he was to
 suffer. Which also the strange and wonderfull signes thereof in
 the Garden do more then cōfirme: as I haue shewed ^b often. Thus
 my meaning is that the nature of *eulabia* admitting the sense som
 time of *Feare* properly, admitteth heere this sense, yea of neces-
 sitie it must admit it for the reason noted aboue. Howbeit I grant
 the Apostle may intend this also by the nature of this worde, that
 Christ notwithstanding all this dreadfull feare, yet (being meere-
 naturall in him) it declined not a jot from *Piety* nor from a most
 reverend regard of obedience to God, which still in all this his
 perplexitie he kept firme and safe. This he may withall (I grant)
 insinuat: yet the other proper feare & grievous dread must needs
 be admitted. To like effect this worde signifieth in that place of
 the ^c Actes: as the Circūstances there also will cōfirme. Now then
 this being in Christ a proper and most vehement feare: where you
 argue *Christ* was delivered from his feare of Hell torments or the
 Death of the Soule. Ergo he suffered them not. I deny your se-
 quele. This proveth directly the contrary. He feared the Death of
 the Soule; specially he thus feared it. Ergo hee did suffer it. For
 Feare being of that which is to come, as ^d you well observe. Ergo
 seeing Christ feared (yea in such maner) the Death of the Soule,
 it surely came vnto him: namely either now, or before he dyed in

^a Ektham
beulhaj.

^{*} Heb. 5.7.

^b Pag. 116. 117.

^c Act. 3.

^d Pag. 116.

the flesh, or both now & then also. For he might well suffer it ^{evē} now, and yet feare it more ensuing. Yea such a maner & measure of Feare, as this manifestly was, could not be but a very Suffering of these spirituall sorrowes. Which also that sheweth where hee saith, *My Soule is full of* (actuall) *sorrowes even vnto death, &c.* Neither is there in this any ^a *doubtfull word*, which is your maner of writing: nor ^b *device unfit for Divinity*, but your Cōparisons of ^c *fearing Captivitie, loosing a purse, &c.* are very vnfit to be matched with this feare in Christ. You thinke this was but a ^d iest, if God be said to have heard Christ and deliuered him from that he feared, and yet to let him suffer it. Forsooth no iest: for he doubtles suffered it as before we haue seene. Nowe nevertheles GOD might well *heare* him 2. wayes: 1. by sufficient sustayning him in it: 2. by delivering him out of it in due time: In one place you seeme to observe a point both strange, and very contrary to your selfe, in saying, ^e *Feare is more intollerable in Christ the doubting.* Is feare so intollerable a thing for him, when as you haue so often and so earnestly affirmed that he feared, and for ^f feare became thus astonished? Where ^{*} you seeke a weake advantage in that I said *eisakoustheis* may seeme to shew that Christ was heard being in that which he was saved from: you see I challenge no certaine but a seeming reason from that worde. But your selfe maketh a stranger cōclusion. Ergo the *Active* referred to God importeth that *God being in the same Paines did heare him.* Lastly you say, *Indeed but in the Garden Christ never prayed with strong cries & teares to be saved frō Death, that we read in the Scriptures.* I hope neither doe you read expresse in the Scriptures at all, that thus he prayed in the Garden. You may soundly gather it from the Scriptures, I graunt, and so you may, that his praying ^h before was of the self same nature and maner, also after in that most dolefull complaint on the Crosse, when he cryed *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.* Where the very like request is plainlie implied, as he made in the Garden when he saide; *Let this Cup passe from.* So that the ⁱ Apostle in all reason may bee vnderstood to have respect to all these tymes and wofull cries of our Saviour Christ. And thus it is without all reason that you say ^k *his Agonie ended in the Garden*: and that on the Crosse hee had ^l *always* *persistance in ioy without obscuration or intermission.* Likewise also

pag. 304.

pag. 306.

pag. 301.

pag. 302.

a. 118. 119

a. 22. 124.

pag. 103.

pag. 121

eb. 12. 27.

eb. 5. 7.

pag. 30.

a. 115. 116

that otherwise his astonishment must ^a continue 18. howers from ^a Pag. 1
his entering into the Garden after supper to the ending of his life the
next day at 3. of the clocke after noone. Howe vaine is this conse-
 quence? how false are these sayings, and contrary to Scripture in
 all the circumstances. But you say, ^b *the cause cōtinuing, the effect* ^b Pa. 301
could not cease. The Cause was, Gods leaving his weake nature in
 these sorrowes at somtimes more, at sometimes lesse: also he is to
 be thought to reveale and inflict the very sorrowes not alwayes in
 one tenor, but sometime more sometime lesse: finally his Man-
 hood apprehended these arrowes of Gods wrath sometime more
 suddainly, then at other times. These were the true causes of his
 Astonishment: but these continued not 18. howers together,
 therefore the effect was not to cōtinue still in that maner on him.
 Then you ^c say, in the vttering of these wordes *the Cup* did passe ^c Pag. 302
 from him, by my owne confession. I cōfesse it not. But I confesse
 his extreame *astonishment* did even quickly passe from him: yet
 the sense and tast of that Cup might continue longer, in such a
 maner and measure, as he was better inabled by his Deitie to su-
 staine it. Now what ill is there in these *conceites*, I pray you. What
 folly is there in them? Against vs heerein you doe nothing els al-
 moste in your large Treatise, but heape vp many and most
 false imputations: That we thinke Christ was in ^d *doubt and feare*
of Gods favour, ^e *desitute of faith, hope, love, joy, forsaken of Gods* ^d Pag. 116
favour, grace, Spirit: that ^f *he continued 18. howers together ama-* ^e Pag. 117
zed as it were in a trance: that he ^g *vehemently and often struggled* ^f Pag. 118
and strived in his prayers against the known Will of God, & sought
by all meanes to decline the worke for which he came into the world:
His flesh feared death, though his Spirit submitted it self to the Will
of his heavenly Father: ^h *We put Christ besides him selfe when it* ^g Pag. 119
pleaseth vs, that he knew not what he prayed, nor prayed in faith. ^h Pag. 120

Your L. if you had reasons but any thing probable, wanterh not
 outward meanes enough to commend your cause: you neede not
 to devise against vs such grosse and base vntruths. But it bewray-
 eth how desperat your matter is, which can not come foorth nor
 make any shew to the world, without such proppes to leane on.
 Besides that which heere in severall places wee haue declared to
 the cōtrary, in our ⁱ former Treatise we shewed our minde though ⁱ Pag. 121
 briefly, yet sufficientlie against these inuiolous speeches. How you
 70-71

114.
116.
103. 103.
fore
114.
ere pag.
113.
128. 110
n. 1. of y
ion. See
ere pag.

fore pag.

Pet. 2.

st. 1. pa.
& heere
120.
129.

134.

53.

seeme to avouch that Christ was by God forsaken in ^a Body, but not in ^b Soule, let them declare that can. For my part I know not your secret therein. I am sure no man can in truth maintaine it. As for ^c Ambrose, you wrest him as you did Hilary, &c. ^d before. After this you are bold, and aske if ^e any dare doubt of your doctrine? Yea surely, I dare not but doubt of it. Also we have seene that the publike ^fauthorised doctrine in England dareth to doubt of it. Which maketh Christes *putting him selfe betweene Gods Wrath and our sinnes* a parte divers from his bodily death on the Crosse, yea the extreamest part of his Passion. See also other ^gauthorised testimonies heereof. But why may not any dare doubt of your doctrine? Because the Scripture saith, ^h Christ suffered for vs. leaving vs an example that we should followe his steppes, &c. And this is very true also: the godly doe followe his steppes heerein (many times) as I ⁱ shewed you before. Some are conformable in some measure with Christe even in these his sufferings. Then ^k you say, we ought to be glad and reioyce thereof. I answer, we ought to turne them to ioy & gladnes, though not properly to be glad of them. Nay we ought most instantly to pray against them: No affliction at all is good in it owne nature: and the greatest of all is good to Gods children by his grace. So that touching this vse of them, therein wee are to reioyce: even when we are most bruized and pearced in our soules with the terrours of God. Lastlie, ^l you frame an obiection against your selfe, which you neither doe nor can answer: *Christes soule might feele the tormentes of Hell for the time without any distrust or doubting of his salvation, or our redemption.* You pretend this answer: *The essentiall tormentes of Hell are the absolute losse of Gods kingdom everlastingly, and that ^m Eternall continuance is of the nature and substance of Hell.* But we shew you, although the damned are in Hell tormentes everlastingly, and of necessitie so must bee: yet *eternall continuance* in them, and to feele them but for a time, are indeed but Circumstances, not of the essence or nature of Hell tormentes. Gods proper and extreame wrath only and his sharpest vengeance for sinne is the essence or nature of Hell paines. Which against the Damned indeed is eternall, and vnsatisfiable: but lighting on Christ it was not eternall, because it was satisfiable. Wherefore it is plain that you have answered in effect nothing to your owne obiection.

Thus

Thus far we have gone, shewing that we ^a neither *extende the cause of Christes Agonie so far* in affirming it to have com of most bitter & extreame Paines which he suffered properly for our sinns: neither that we *continue it to long* in affirming that he felt the same most extremely on the Crosse. Contrariwise that you curtaile it to short, when you say it was no more but ^b Devotion to God and Compassion to men: also that Christes Agonie touched him ^c not at all on the Crosse. So that ^d our Maine argument which you would haue frustrated, standeth firme and good still: that seeing his Agonies, Paines, and Feares were such & so great (as the Scripture by the effectes & signes sheweth that they were) both before his death and at his death, therefore they were more then meere bodily paines and more then meere bodily death: much lesse were his Holy and Religious affections the proper and speciall Cause thereof. But (of necessity) they were the Paines proceeding from the infinit and sharpe Iustice of God which Christ truly suffered in his Spirit, and Soule and Body.

After this ^a you set vehemently against my last argument, That Christ suffered in some sorte the *death of the Soule*. First if wee should speake strictly after the maner of *Death in the Body*, then no man is so mad or foolish as to say that any mans Soul can dye at all: that is, want life and sense, as ^a a dead body doth. Thus the very damned soules in Hell suffer not death. But such a death as immortall soules are subiect vnto, is Gods separation fro them. And this is 2. folde. The 1. *death* and the 2. *death*, as the Scripture speaketh. The 1. is the separation of them from Gods grace, which is in this life by sinne reigning in them. The 2. death is Gods leaving them in the feeling of the most sharpe and most vehemēt paines inflicted by Gods iustice for sinne. This last kind of death is so called and named in many places of ^b Scripture. It hath also a double consideration. First, *ordinarily* and commonly it belongeth only to the Damned for their owne inherent sinne, where withall are the ordinary Accidents and cōcomitants togeather, Desperation, induration, blaspheming, viter darkenes, &c. with Perpetuities of punishment, and that locally in Hell. In this sense the Fathers generally do take it, where they deny that Christ suffered the *death of the Soule*: and so likewise do we. Secondly, *The death of the Soule, or the 2. death may be extraordinaryly and*

a Pag. 233

b Pag. 233

c Pag. 233

d Before

90. 91.

116.

a Pag. 233

b Pag. 233

c Pag. 233

d Before

90. 91.

116.

a Pag. 233

b Pag. 233

c Pag. 233

d Before

90. 91.

116.

a Pag. 233

b Pag. 233

c Pag. 233

d Before

90. 91.

116.

a Pag. 233

b Pag. 233

c Pag. 233

d Before

90. 91.

116.

a Pag. 233

b Pag. 233

c Pag. 233

d Before

90. 91.

116.

a Pag. 233

b Pag. 233

c Pag. 233

d Before

90. 91.

116.

the Death
the Soule
will tasted

g. 113.
g. 115.

g. 112.

g.

g. 112.
& 113.

proofes.

1.

g. 5. 7.

singularly considered, namely to imply no more but simply the very nature and essence of it. That is, the feeling of most deadly infinite paines inflicted by God himselfe in his proper iustice for sinne, all sense also of his comfortable presense being taken away. This is a *Death* to the Soule, as before we have shewed: according to this sense the Scriptures & Fathers before noted may rightly be vnderstood not to deny it in Christ: so that this kind of Death in the soule (but none other) we may safely say, Christ did suffer for our sinne imputed to him. Moreover, let it be observed: that if wee had no proofes at all in Scripture for this point, yet our Question is fully proved & confirmed notwithstanding by those other sufficient & pregnant proofes alleaged & justified before. For it is to be noted, that no man setteth the questiō in these termes, *That Christ dyed in his soule*, neither doe we at all vse them very much in speaking of this matter. We do, only when some speciall occasion draweth it from vs: neither then do we vtter it in those termes but with vsing some further declaration of our minde. The reason of this waynes is, because we are not ignorant how ambiguous the phrase is, and how apt to be mistaken, specially when men list to cavill. Also people vntaught and vnsetled in construing the scriptures sense do quickly take offense at thinges, which they ought better to digest. So that you doe very iniuriously to grate still one this phrase of speech and to straine it to the worst, as you do: as if by no meanes it could beare any good sense, and as if we built our maine Assertion onely heerevpon. Which in truth is nothing so. The same also doe we affirme touching our vsing (in this matter) the phrase of *Christs suffering Hell paines*. Both these phrases are but seldome and respectively vsed by vs. Howbeit we deny not, but that both these phrases may be well and rightly applied vnto Christ on occasion, as before is observed: & may both serve truly and most emphatically to expresse the infinitnes of the paines and sorrowes of his suffering for vs. Yea this very phrase of death extended in Christ further then to his meere bodily dying, hath (I doubt not) expresse ground in the Scripture: and therefore may the better be vsed soberly, & admitted charitably. You will aske where is there any scripture, that Christe suffered any other death then that meere of his body? I answer, First consider well that to the f. Hebr. *Hee offered vp prayers and supplications with strong*

from crying & teares to him that was able to save him from death. It is not possible that this *Death* heere should be his meere bodily *Death*, which he so wofully and impotently feared: as I haue before sufficiently confirmed. Therefore it was the *death of the soule*, the 2. *Death* which heere is vnderstood to haue thus mightily afflicted Christ. Which also your own selfe do^d fully grant and as-
 firme with me. Yea you affirme further then we doe, or then the truth is, or possibly can be. You say Christ heere thus feared *Eternall death* and *Everlasting damnation*. What a speech is this? Christ could not possibly feare in such wofull maner that, which he perfectly knew should never come neere him. But he perfectly knew that *eternall Death*, and the *Cup of Gods everlasting malediction* should never touch him. He knew and saw that this by Gods almighty and vchangeable Decree was set further from him then the East is from the West, yea then Hell is from Heaue. Therefore he could not by any meanes possibly feare *eternall death*, nor pray in such sort against it. Againe, that which he feared, and so pitifully prayed against was that, which he knew was by God^e ordayned for him. Yea Feare alwayes is of that which is to come. But *Eternall death* was not by God ordayned for him: that was "not to come vnto him. Therefore it was not *Eternall death* which he so feared. Finally when in the Garden he prayed against that *Cup* which he feared, that it might passe from him, there he yeelded and submitterh himselfe presently to the vndergoing of it. But it were, I know not what, to say, that Christ did ever yeeld and submit himselfe to vndeigo *Eternall death*, or to taste the *Cup of Gods everlasting malediction*. Therefore it was not this, that he feared & heere prayed against. And yet it was I grant the *Death of the Soule*, or the 2. *Death*: that is simply the essence thereof, Gods withdrawing himselfe from him in the Paines and torments thereof. This onely it was, not the *eternity* thereof nor *sinfull concomitants*, which he thus feared. And this (for the infirmities of it) naturally he could not but feare, yea and that so extremely: also he feared ^e for him selfe, as knowing it to be ordayned for him. So that hence it followeth invincibly, that Christ in deed suffered (sith he thus feared) more then the meere bodily *Death*, even the *Death of the soule*. For he could not (I say) thus feare, but he must needs know that it was to come or might come.

d Pag.

e John Y

" While
Christ
rightHe said
that
which
he
feared.

f s. 10. 11.

* Much
yeeld
he did
ing. Thy
den.

gish. What is this to Christes *Flesh* and *Spirit*. Thinke you that Christes Soule was willing to suffer as God had appointed, but that his *Flesh* resisted? Verily so you seeme heere to vnderstand: and it is as likely, as your applying of *Flesh* and *Spirit* to Christ in your pag. 104. Then ^a *Luke*; where both *Spirit* and *Flesh* are not intended of Christ (as our observation before requireth) but only the *Flesh*. Then the *Romanes*: where I affirme that ^b *Flesh* signifieth the whole Manhood of Christ according to the which he came from David even as well as Salomō or Nathan did, who were Davids sonnes in their entire and *perfit* nature. So likewise Christe was kinne to the Iewes according to his ^c whole Humanitie, as well as ^d Paul was. And heere Paul meaneth him selfe to be kinne to them according to Nature wholly, & that only by Regeneration in the Gospell he was differing from them. Now Nature opposed to Grace and regeneration, hath reference both to *Soule* and *Body* in a man. Howsoever the Soule cometh in Generation, that is not heere considered; neither is it necessarily to the purpose. Which *difficulty* also your selfe haue vtterly ^e renouced before, to make it any argument for you in this matter. Thus yet the *Flesh* and the *Spirit* thus opposed heere in Christ, shall signifie the whole *Manhood* and *Godhead* in him. Further, that which ^f you bring out of the ^g *Corinthians* compared with this in *Peter*, doeth most fitlie and clearely open and confirme the same: *Hee was crucified ton- abing his infirmities, but liueth by the power of God*. His infirmities the text heere nameth *Metonimically* vnderstanding in Christ that, in which his infirmities were. Now his Soule had infirmities of suffering in it, as well as his body. Therefore his Soule also is vnderstood heere that it was *Crucified and dyed*, that is according to the condicion thereof, as likewise his body according to the condicion thereof. And thus that which Paul calleth *infirmities*, Peter calleth *Flesh*; and that which Paul calleth *the power of God*, Peter calleth *the Spirit*. That is, his Deitie is set oppositly in both these places to his whole Humanitie, even to body and soule. To which purpose that place also to the ^h *Romanes* doth serue, where the like opposition is found (as I have shewed) betwene the *Flesh* and the *Spirit* in Christ, that is his *Manhood* and *Godhead*. Other reasons also ⁱ I haue noted seruing well heerevnto (as the 4, 5, and 6.) but I omit to rehearse them againe. For it seemeth your selfe

agreeth with vs in them : holding ^a expressly that *the Spirit* heere in Peter is the Deitie of Christ according to *Austins* iudgement. Now this being granted and acknowledged, that the Spirit heere signifieth Christes Godhead, how can it be likely but that the other opposit part *the Flesh*, must needs import his whole and intire Manhood. Verily thus it seemeth most plaine that *Peter* heere distributeth the whole and absolute person (both God and Man) into these Natures, the *Flesh* and *the Spirit*. Wherefore I can not thinke, but that the Apostle heere vnderstandeth by *Flesh* the whole and intire Manhood of Christ, even his Soule and his body. Now this being so, then it followeth by the text that Christ in his Passion was *don to death* both in Soule, & body. Heere " you obiekt, that thus I make all the attributes of the body common to the Soule. Nay forsooth, that I doe not. Nor yet this attribute of Dying vnderstood in such sort and maner, as the Body properly dyeth: that is to become without life and sense. I ascribe Death to both, but yet according to the diuers condicion and state of both. And thus you might vnderstand my ^b meaning to be, where I say it is absurd & false that Christ was *made alive* in his Humane Soule: that is, it neither lost nor recovered life and sense, so as his body did. Howbeit as Death is oftentimes attributed to mens soules in the ^c Scripture, that is the feeling of the extreame wrath of God and the punishment for sinne, so ^d I make Death commo both to Christes Soule and body, even to his whole and intire humane Nature, Which if you do not acknowledge, the shame of absurditie and cotrarietie which in your fancy ^e you accuse me of, that Christes Soule *died* and *died not*, will sit neerer to you then to me. Also in such a sense I deny nor but Christ may be said, that he was *quickened in the Spirit*, that is refreshed and comforted againe in his Soule, and restored from that bottomles gulfe of sorowes to the lively feeling of heavenly ioyes and glory, which for a season he had no sense of at all. Howbeit though this sense be a true *quickening in his Soule*, yet I deny that heere in this place of *Peter* it can be translated *quickened in the Spirit* meaning the Soule, because Spirit heere in this opposition is set indeed for the Deitie of Christ, as before I have shewed. Thus the matter I hope is cleere to reasonable men, that Christes Soule even according to the Scripture phrase may be said in some sorte to have tasted and

suffice

suffered Death, that is the extreamest feelings of Gods wrath for sinne, and the most vehement paines of the damned, though not as the damned doe in respect of the Accidents and concomitance of their ordinary damnation, but in a singular manner and extraordinarie way as became the sonne of God and a sinles man (yet a very mā) being our Redeemer. Now besides the matter you *"gird"* at me in divers places: as where I say, The Death of the Soule is such Paines and sufferings of Gods wrath, as *alwayes accompanie them that are separated from the grace and love of God.* Forsooth it is true, they are *alwayes* wicked whom these Paines doe accompanie *ordinarily.* They came vpon Christ *extraordinarily:* as in ^a this place I expressly noted. That was therefore my meaning here, if you would haue scene it. In another place also by you know that I say, Hell as I take it (that is such paines of Gods wrath) is ^a *sometime* found in this life. Thus then you might haue vnderstood my former wordes: and not that the tormentes of Hell doe *alwayes* accompanie the wicked in this life. I pray conceave not my meaning, against my expresse wordes. Again ^c you pretende to haue much against me where I say, The feeling of the sorrowes of Gods wrath due to sinne *in a broken and contrite heart, is indeed the only true and perfectly accepted sacrifice to God.* True, so I said, and againe I say it. What see you amisse in it? Then *unhappy men are the godly which are at any time free from the paines of the damned.* To what purpose is this? I speake of Christs Sacrifice. I pray, is any other Sacrifice perfectly accepted? or a Sacrifice at all, but Secondly, that is in and by Christes Sacrifice? They are not. His Sacrifice then is the onely true Sacrifice, and perfectly accepted to God. All others are imperfitt, and accepted not in them selues but only in and by Christ. Thus your triumphes before the victorie, come to nothing but blastes of vanitie. But *Augustin* doth flatly deny that this text can be thus vnderstood, or that Christes Soule might dy. *Augustin* denyeth that Christ suffered any paines of damnation locally in Hell after his death, as it seemeth some helde about his time who here he laboureth to confute. So that he meaneth to reprove onely the ^a *1st* sense of the Death of the Soule in him, viz. that he suffered it not *Ordinarily* after the manner of other men, nor any way locally. He hath no necessitie cause to speake of the *2^d* sense thereof, how the Soule may be said to suffer death Ex-

a Pag. 31

a Treat. 2

pag. 77

b Pag. 33

a Treat. 1

pag. 80

c Pag. 32

† Pag. 32

d Epist. 9

e See be

pag. 2

de verb.
Ser 30.
Trin. 4.
fore pag.
113.
108. 113
134.

traordinarily for sinne imputed only, neither doeth he speake against that in Christ. Nay according to *Austins* owne Definition of the Soules Dying it will easily appeare that Christes Soule may be said to have suffered some kinde of Death. Saith he *Moritur anima si recedit Deus*: and *Mors est spiritus deserti à Deo*. The Death of the Soule is Gods Forsaking of it. But the Scripture saith God did leave him, or forsake him for a season: yea the Fathers also agree fully therewith: the manner how ^a I have shewed before. Therefore by *Austins* definition largely and rightly taken, Christ may be said in some sense to have dyed in Soule. Howbeit though the Fathers doe graunt the thing in effect (as I have shewed) yet I acknowledge they doe deny this phrase generally, and so doeth *Austin* in this place. But thereabout we never made question: this is no parte of our matter. It may bee even for the same cause they shunned it, for which we also doe vse it very rarely and warily, as ^a before I observed. And let this be the Answer touching all your Fathers and Councells, which you bring about and there) about this point of the Soules death. Though peradventure some of them may seeme to insinuat even this very phrase touching Christ sometime, as in some I touched before.

Where you say, ^a *Aske the simplest child that is Catechized in my charge if I have any, what death Christ dyed for vs, and hee will answer me out of his Creed, Christ was Crucified, Dead, & Buried.* It is true: But our authorized Catechisme published by M. Nowel, and the Homily ^a sheweth the meaning heereof to be, that Christ suffered far more sharply the meere bodily Death, even the infinite paines of Gods wrath in his soule. Wh^{ch} I pointed you vnto ^a before, but you fairly leape it over, as also the Archb. speciall allowance (with others) of M. Now. Catechisme as being fully grounded on the word of God & consayning the very doctrine of the Church of England. Now to this effect the youths in my charge being asked would have answered surely. For indeed such a charge in London I had I thank God, wherein I hope I was faithfull according to my power, & might have continued, had not your ill seasoned teaching so contrary to the established doctrine in Englande burst forth.

^a You say, I should have don well to have laid that downe for a shew, which is written in Esay, ^b *Hee laid downe his Soule unto death*; verily if I had, it would have made some shew. Considering that

135.
13.
has pow-
ant.

that you earnestly affirme that this word signifieth *Soule* (or *Spiritus*) in a proper sense. Also how resolute you are forbidding to *divert from the native & proper significations of words, but when the letter impugneth the groundes of Christian faith and charity.* This considered, surely that in *Esay* maketh some shew indeede, that Christ *submitted, and humbled, and afflicted, even his Soule to Death.* The rather if we note that which followeth: *He was counted with the sinners, and bare the sinne of many.* That is, he was punished by God as the sinners are punished, and was not by the Jewes onely counted among Theeves. But chiefly considering withall that also before, *He made his soule a sinne offering.* Heere you must remember, *we shall leave nothing sound & sure in Gods word, if we may avoid all things by figures, that please not our humours.* Therefore you must needes grant that Gods worde heere maketh Christs *Soule* to be *sacrificed* for our sinne. And we desire no other death of the *Soule.* We deny not but this phrase *Anima ponere* is to lay downe the life, and in divers places signifieth no more then simply to *Dy*, both concerning Christ and other men: as you observe pag. 70. Yet this is no necessary reason, that heere in *Esay* the *Soule* should be taken figuratively, for the *Life* onely: the rather seeing heere the text precisely setteth down the great & perfect worke of our Redemption. And to take it as we do literally, impugneth no ground at all of *faith* or *Charity.* The like peradventure may bee affirmed also of that in *Mathew*, *The sonne of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his soule a ransom for many:* although the translatours commonly turne it, *his life.* But I wil not strive about these phrases. Ant. hath not a word against vs in that great place which you cite: his whole argument there being to another purpose. The Jewes slew *only* the flesh of Christ: and yet it is true that they slew Christ. Who doubteth this? Also, where you thinke those words to be so *plaine and expresse* as may be spoken, so effectfull as Pauls heart could invent or his tongue utter, that Christ reconciled vs to God in the body of his flesh through death, we have answered you before. As for al your other discourse heere against me, it is as every where almost nothing but revilings, and reproches, and bitter scoffes. Yet you say, *I have not learned, nor used to give reviling speeches.* Have you not learned it? Is it then naturall vnto you? Nay you meant these

d Pa. 209

c Pag. 24

f See before
pag. 70.g Isa. 53.
† You p.

h Mar 2

i Pag. 12

k Pag. 13

† Pag. 45

l Pag. 102.
m Pag. 26

are *Fatherly* *Warnings* and *admonitions*. If your *Fatherly* *admonitions* are such, what are your *Lordly* *rebukes*? If these bee your *Bishoply* *blessings*, what are your *Cursings*? But I am to blame; heerein standeth not the tryall of our question. As for all those *bogepots* (as you call them) which you make of my wordes, they are nothing but your owne either wilfull writhings, or vncharitable surmises: as by every particular in their places may be scene. Finally that is not true where you say, *Flesh* doth often signifie the soule in vs. It signifieth often the whole *Manhood* together in vs, and so it may and doth in *Christ* as well. Also it signifieth in vs many times our whole and intire *corrupt nature* both in body and soule: so it neuer signifieth in *Christ*. And heere I desire the reader to change a word or two in my former *Treatise*: for *Paul* *mayes* to set *usually*, and for *a man* to set *Christ*. Because since I find that *Flesh* and *Spirit* together applyed vnto men doe 2 ouer signifie meere the Body and Soule; which then I thought *every where* did signifie in vs our *corrupt* and *regenerat* man. Which oversight the Bishop spyeth not, but in this place confirmeth indeed.

Finally to make an ende with your *Fathers* and *Councils*: it is strang that you thus vainly boast of them, saying they are all wholly for you for this 1400. yeares space. I have shewed before that your large claime, proveth a very short gaine. For in substance and full effect they are evidently and generally against you, and for vs. As for their denying that *Christ Dyed in his Soule*, I have answered to that before. Further where you bring them in many places saying, by his *blood only* he redeemed vs, and he suffered *only in his Body*: they are abused by you wonderfully. Not in their words, but in their meaning. For they striving against *Arians* and such other *Hæretikes* who would have *Christs* *Deity* to take part in his sufferings for our redemption, & so consequently would prove it inferior to the Father, the godly *Ancient Writers* do heerevpon say, he suffered & satisfied for vs only in his body, in his flesh, &c. not excluding the proper & immediat sufferings of his *Spirit*, nor any passible part of his *Manhood*, but onely his *Godhead* against those *Hæretikes*: shewing thus also, that no other Creature besides him or with him satisfied any way for vs altogether after the *Apostles* like phrase in many places. Let the *Authors* themselves be viewed, if you thinke I affirme of them

fully

falsly. *Tertullian* and *Cyrril* will give a tast heereof for all the rest.
Tertullians wordes *id est carnem*, *that is to say Christs flesh*, are
 expressly opposed to his Deity, not to his Soule: so that evidently he
 meaneth thereby his whole and intire passible Manhood. If hee
 had meant to exclude any parte or faculty of his Soule from suf-
 fering, as he doth his Godhead, he had confirmed that Heresy a-
 gainst w^{ch} he striveth, as ^e before I noted. Also it seemes he yeeld-
 ed the name of *Death* to this suffering of Christes whole Man-
 hood, in saying *Quod unctum est mortuum ostendit: that Dyed*
which received the Annoyning. For I hope his spirit was Annoin-
 ted with the Holy Ghost, as well as his Flesh. And he saith thus, as
 indefinitely, so also by way of oppositiō to his Deity, as I said: there-
 fore he meaneth the whole Manhood dyed. Howbeit in what sort
 this might be, I shewed ^e before. My false translating of him which
 you note, is not worth the noting. But you doe worse in false pla-
 cing those his last rehearsed words for advantage: in *Tertull.* they
 are vsed more generally in their owne place coming long before
 those words, after which you set them. As for that *Denique posuit*
spiritū, &c. it sheweth that Christs bodily death also (but not on-
 ly) came by reason of Gods forsaking and separating from him.
 For before we saw how *Tertull.* expressly attributeth Gods *Dere-*
lectio both to his soule & body on the Crosse: though you grudge
 thereat. Thus (I say) he excepteth only his Godhead from *Dere-*
liction and *Suffering* &c. *Cyrril* also even in that book which you
 cite for you, sheweth that he excludeth but Christs Deity, though
 he mention only his suffering in Flesh: *Carne passum dicit, docens*
patiendi ineffabilem naturam a passionibus alienam. Deus igitur
Christus Divinē quidem impassibilis, passibilis secundum carnem.
 He excludeth only the Deity from suffering, when he saith, hee
 suffered in his Flesh. In a word, so do all the rest, as ^e before is part-
 ly noted. Against Nestorius ⁱ they affirme the vnion of Christes
 Natures, with preserving the properties of each. They therefore
 hold not his *only bodily sufferings*. Is this then your great boast of
 all the Fathers and Councells? Nay, are they well vsed at your
 hands, to be thus drawn cleane from their purpose to an opinion
 which they never thought of? Is this good dealing towards Gods
 people, to tell them that the Fathers generally teach the *only bodi-*
ly sufferings of Christ, and deny our Assertion of his Soules pecu-

e Pag. 151
 d Contr. 10

e Pag. 122

* pag. 117
 135. 136

* Hæc
 animæ
 potis

† Ad Rom.
 lib. 1.

h Pag.

i Pag. 151

more
47. 48.
66. 71.
82. 112.

that suffering, which they iustifie & confirme indeed? Yea, thirdly the profit that comes by ordinary flanting with Fathers, which vse many do frequent in these dayes. Think they, if the Scriptures alone suffice not for all thinges in Religion, that the Fathers will suffice? Or if the Fathers make a sense vpon some text, that therefore this must be the right meaning alwayes? Or if the Scriptures may be wrested by subtile heades, that yet the Fathers cannot? Or that Gods people may sooner see and finde when the Fathers are abused, then when the Scriptures are? It is great pity that men are, yea wilbe so deceaved with vaine shews. Let vs in Gods name content our selves (in handling matters of Religion) onely with Gods al sufficient worde: vnles where the importunity of an Adversary forceth vs. Otherwise let vs spare the Authority of men in Gods matters, to them that make an Idoll of it. Finally if in this case we were to looke after any man, surely we have more cause to regard our later faithfull Teachers, rather then those of old. Who being equall with the best of them in any of the excellent graces of Gods spirit which hee vseth to bestow on his servants for the edifying of the Church, yet heerein these have advantage of the former, that they were directly provoked & occasioned to study and sift out this question against the Papists, which the Ancients were not occasioned to do.

143.

143.

After, you set your self to prove that in Hell there is materiall fire. But it seemeth you are now almost afraid so to call it: yet you call it *true fire*. Which also we vterly deny. All your proofs (such as they are) runne to prove *corporall* and *materiall* fire: yet eternall. Except your Scriptures, which vterly prove nothing at all: for they shew no more any *corporall*, or *materiall*, or *true* fire to be now in Hell, then a *corporall* *verme*, *materiall* *brimston*, and *much wood*, & *true chaines*. Which you say is a *sleevatos objection*, but neither your selfe, nor *Austin* whom you cite against it, doth any where answer it. Yea *Austin* thinketh that incorporall spirits *shalbe* fastened to corporall fire. But he saith not that *now* they are: which only is our question or, els nothing. For my parte I see no reason to believe that now there is corporall fire in Hell, whatsoever there *shalbe* heereafter when Bodies also *shalbe* there vnted and tormented with the Soules. Against *Austin* heere doth not prove that there *shalbe* such fire: hee only sheweth the manner

how it may be so hereafter, if God will. Now if all your reason be the power of God only, then aswel you may prove that the sky is fallen. For as touching Gods will heerein, you name it indeed, but you shew it no where, nor seeme to shew it. All the rest say nothing further, nor indeed so far as *Anst. in*. Yet you thinke it may be called ^a *a true created fire*. That no Christian ever doubted of, if you meane that it is a true creature. If you meane simply, that it is true fire, that still we deny. And me thinks you should not care for corporall fire now in Hell, seeing you seeme to believe no torments for Damned soules save only at the Resurrection. For thus you reason, ^b *As the Body hath ben the instrument of the Soules pleasure (in sinne) so it shalbe of hir paine.* ^c *But all provocations and pleasures of sinne the soule taketh from her body, all acts of sinne she committeth by her body.* Therefore the iustice of God both temporally and eternally punisheth the Soule (only) by the Body. Or Therefore all the Soules paine for sinne both temporally & eternally is by the Body. This is your owne reason: which being true, why should you care for corporall fire in Hell, before the last iudgment?

a Pag. 170

b Pag. 171

c Pag. 171

Your striving to ^a confute my allegations of Fathers, I hope I have refuted sufficiently before. And then ^b *Sir Refuter endeth as he began with egregious lyes.* What lyes began he with, and with what doth he end? In the begining our lyes have proved tales of truth, and in the end your wordes will prove iniurious at least: I said, that *not some, or the most, or best, but even all & everyone* both Churches & Writers in the world who are Protestants, teach as we do: except only your selfe, or happily some after you, since the year 1597. What ly is there in al this? Why name you not in al the world one man (of those whom we call Protestants) of your minde? that it may appeare who deserveth such rebukes. Nay in this, being the very point of the matter you are silent: in revilings, outcries, and accusations you exceed.

a Pag. 171

b Pag. 171

Where I avouch that ^a *only the hoatest and cunningest Papists, Jesuits, Priests, & Fryars have alwayes untill this day had this controversy with all Protestants, and all Protestants against them: & namely Bellarmine, Campian, English Rhemists, &c.* To al this scandalous & suspicious argument you reply not a syllable. What shall we thinke of such doctrine, which in this learned age hath none

c Treat. 1.

Pag. 171

but such defenders. And yet among the Papists I noted 2, *Casus* and *Fermus* as liking of the Protestants doctrine herein, which also they do in some other matters. Now these 2. and only these (though more there are)^c you cite at large: whose wordes indeede (especially the Fryars) seeme excessive. But our owne most worthy and learned Teachers^d *M. Fulke*, *M. Deering*, *M. Whistlers* which against you I alleaged, you vouchsafe not a looke towards them. Nor to *M. Nowels Catechisme*, nor to the Synod authorising it, nor to the Archb: great^e approbation thereof: Nor to our Common Bibles note authorised publikly to be read thorough out England. Only against my alleaging of our Homilyes^e you take exception: but I trust I have before fully and cleerely defended them to bee for vs; and against you. Neither doeth any such matter appeare in them as^f you avouch. Thus then I end our 1. Question: being sorry that I have ben so long. But I trust the friendly Reader will pardon me, considering how I have ben occasioned thereto.

A brief Collection containing the whole effect of our Doctrine before delivered: brought into 4. Assertions.

1. God himselfe in his Justice properly punished Christ for our sinnes. See pag. 2. p. 75. 2a.
2. Christ (even as other men) consisted of a perfect Humane immortall Spirit, and a mortall Body: and so was by nature capable of suffering sorrows for sinne from Gods hand as well in his Spirit peculiarly and properly, as also in his Soule and Body together: sith other men do thus suffer for sinne. pag. 2. 48. 52. 61. 74.
3. Gods exact and immutable Justice spared his Sonne in nothing: but did punish him with severity as he punisheth sinners. I meane, Hee punished him in All his partes of nature to suffer: that is, in his Spirit peculiarly and properly, and in his Soule and Body together also. Againe God punished him with all the Whole Generall Curse not with all the particular Curses and punishments: with the Generall Curse in all the whole Nature and substance of him not with all the Circumstances: with all the meere Paine and Sorrow thereof, not with the sinfull Adherents and concomitants in it. pag. 2. 13. 74. 16.
4. Gods exact & immutable Justice spared not Christ in these Circumstances of Punishment so he suffered not. For either in exact Justice he could not, or necessarily hee needed not to punish him so. In exact Justice he could not punish Christ in such respects as were simply and absolutely impossible. It was simply impossible that any touch of Sinne should once come neere his person, or Evernall suffering, or all the Particular punishments in the world: All which come not to any one man (though Damned,) neither can come. Finally that Christ should necessarily have suffered after this life, or locally in Hell, there was no cause: seeing these are but usual Circumstances of Gods Just Punishment of sinne, whether now, or then, whether heere or there. These alter not the nature of Gods wrath, which is the strength of Hell. The whole substance of nature of that Punishment he might see in this life as well as any part: God is able to see it as well heere, as heereafter. The rather seeing Christ came and was sent of God Extravagantly of purpose to suffer for sin all that he might suffer. Thus then only in this life Christ suffered and did suffer all. For so was Gods ordinance and will, as it is plainly expressed in his word. Therefore so we profess, and so we believe by the certaine rule of Gods word and the proportion of faith: Christ suffered for our sake nothing (which the Damned suffer) except the Circumstances and Accidents, impossible or unnecessary, nor any part of the Punishment decreed against sinne. pag. 13. 14. 16. 48. 66. 75. 77. 124. 441.

That Christ after his death on the Crosse went not downe into Hell in his Soule.

THe 2. part of our Controverſie is this, *That Chriſt after his death on the Crosse went not downe into Hell in his Soule.*
Where note firſt, that we vnderſtand *Hell* properly and locally (as our common ſpeech in Engliſh doth vſually take it) for the very place of the Damned after this life. Now againſt them that be-
lieue Chriſtes Soule did go down locally into Hell, thus I reaſon:
Firſt, *If there be a good and ſound generall reaſon in Chriſtian faith that Chriſtes Soule leaving his Body aſcended vp to Heaven and there remained till his Reſurrection, and if there be no ſpeciall reaſon of authority to the contrary that his Soule now deſcended downward: then ſurely every good Chriſtian ought ſo believe that his Soule aſcended to Heaven, and deſcended not locally into Hell.* But both thoſe former pointes are moſt true: Firſt, *There is a good ſound generall reaſon in Chriſtian faith that Chriſtes Soule after death aſcended to Heaven, & remayned there till his Reſurrection.* Namely the Analogy of faith requireth that the Head ſhould bee there where the members were: and where they remaine till their Reſurrection, that there he tary till his Reſurrection. It ſeemeth alſo theſe texts will prove it: *Where I am, there alſo ſhall my ſervants be. I will that where I am, there they alſo ſhall be with me.* I ſee not but that he promiſeth here his ſervants even a locall accompanying of him after this life, & that alſo generally whither ſoever he went. Moreover this the Fathers & all with one voyce (I may truly affirme) do teach and believe: even that Chriſt after death went no whither, but where his faithfull and holy ſervants were: yea and there remayned till his Reſurrection. To which conſent of men ſomewhere you aſcrib exceeding much, ſo that *you plainly avouch the contrary alwayes to be a notorious, if not a pernicious novelty.* To which purpoſe alſo other Scriptures doe make very much: as where Chriſt, being in the paines of death and preſently about to end his life, ſaith *Father into thy hands I commend my ſoule.* This being ſpoken at ſuch a time, in the depth of ſuch wo-
full ſorrowes, and by ſuch a perſon, in all good reaſon *God* *hath*

Notes

Reasons
gainſt Ch
Deſcending
locally in
Hell.

Two
points to
be
conſidered.

a Joh. 14
b cap. 15

c Only
where
miſg.
where
d Perpet
vern. op
to.

whereinto he commended his Soule (according to our common
 use of speech) must be Gods ioyfull peace, and Heavenly glory.
 which is also suitable to the scripture phrase, as "already I have
 shewed: neither shew* you any thing against this. For what if Gods
 hands on other occasions do signifie his Power, and generall pro-
 tection only. Doth it follow that therefore Holy men (oppressed
 with paines, and now about to Dy) when they say, *Father into thy
 hands I commend my Soule*, they meane not the ioyes of Heave?
 You aske *was David dying* when he spake those words? He might
 bee in deadly sorrowes or dangers, for any thing you know to
 the contrary. But suppose he were not the in danger to dy. Yet the
 Prophets generall sentence may fitly be applyed to this more spe-
 ciall case of Christ: as all men know. Howsoever then David were
 when he spake thus, yet Christ (now dying, & ready to come out
 of most wofull paines) doth surely meane when he said so, (as o-
 ther holy men do in like case) namely, to go to Heav'n. To like
 purpose serveth that comfort, given to the Theefe and common
 to himselfe: *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.* As
 touching *Austins* divers opinion and yours, see "before. Be you
 reconciled vnto him, and then let him speake for you. Lastlie,
 where the eternal and generall Ordinance of God is shewed to be
 such, that *none can goe out of Heaven downe to Hell, nor come
 from Hell vp to Heaven. The text excepteth heere not one. This
 therefore I doubt not is in truth a cleere point (against which we
 shall find not a worde in scripture) that *Christ's Soule after death*
was there where the holy Patriarkes deceased were, & there remay-
ned till his Resurrection. So that how you will doe to maintaine
 that Christ* went indeed vnto them, but presently left them that
 hee might go to Hell, I know not. In this I doubt you walke
 & without your guide. But to proceed, I adde that which is a cleere
 and certaine: yea that which & your selfe rightly beleeveth and
 professeth with vs, though against the opinion of the Fathers.
That the Soules of the holy Patriarkes dead before Christ were not
beneath, but above, not in Limbo, but with God in peace, joy, & blisse
even in Paradise, that is, in Heaven. The which to be a doctrine
 most true (against the Popish error heerein) I have briefly
 to fore, yet (I hope) sufficiently proved. Therefore hence I con-
 clude, that *Christ's Soule after his death Ascended indeed,*

Treat. 1.
 pg. 111.
 161.

pg. 160
 pg. 161.

16. 16

16. 16

16. 16

16. 16

16. 16

16. 16

16. 16

descended ~~on~~ downward beneath vs beere. 1. Only except there be some speciall reason of good authority to the contrary: which is the second point of importance heere to be considered. Touching which this I say, without expresse and evident Scripture there is in the worlde no sound nor meet authority to disprove our former Reason, and Conclusion. This also *Austin* himselfe avoucheth well and faithfully: that is, supposing there is no expresse nor plaine Scripture for Christs Descending, then (saith he) *is were marvailous bouldnes that any should dare say he went down to Hell.* And againe *Nemo de Christo credat nisi quod de se credi voluit Christus.* No man ought to believe any thing concerning Christ, but what himselfe (in his word) would have us to believe. Now I assume this, and by Gods helpe shall make it manifest, That there is in all the Scripture no one place whereby it may bee proved by any shew of reason that Christs Soule after this life went locally downward from hence, or diversly from the Soules of all good men deceased besides. Yea whatsoever is pretended from the Scripture expressly to prove that he did Descend, is but very little, and exceeding weak. Only there are 2. or 3. places sensibly wrested and drawn to this purpose. 1. That, where Christ is said to have *come downe into the lowest partes of the earth.* But I have largely and plainly shewed that this place speaketh not a whit neither of Hell, nor of Christs Soule descending locally; neither before his death, nor after. It noteth only Christs sensible and apparant Humiliation to the last and lowest point, that is to the Grave. According to the Hebrue phrase, which the Apostles frequented in their Greeke writings very much. So that no reason appeareth why or how this place may shew that his Soule after death went downward. The rather seeing you, will have Christes going downe to Hell the first, and that a notable part of his exaltation and triumph. But this was manifestly (as I said) his lowest abasement. Therefore this toucheth not his going down to Hell. Where you expound the text, & say, *He descended to the lowest and ascended to the highest that he might fill all places with the presence of his Manhood.* you speake both inconveniently, and far from the Apostles meaning. Who signifieth only Christes filling all his Church with the gift of his Spirit, which by his Ascending he promised to doe, and so did indeed. Hence is nothing about his filling all (places) with the

a. Epist. 9
Mirror of
guilt and
repentance
d. 1. 1. 1.
and 1. 1.
b. Serm. 1.
temp. 1. 1.

No Script
at all y
Soule at
death
descended.

Script. p.
ded.

v.
c. Your p.
312.
d. Eph. 4.
e. Trinit.
pag. 1. 1.

d. Pag. 40

e. Pag. 30

i. In resp.
vbiq.
g. Eph. 1.
& 1. 19.
h. 1. 1. 1.
Luk. 24.
1. 1. 1. 1.

presence of his manhood. Much lesse is there expressly in the text
 that which ⁴ you adde to it (*with his presence*) very deceitfully in
 a differing letter like the text and together with the text. What
 censurē this deserveth the godly doe knowe. Wherefore yet wee
 must be so scrupulous still, as to stick at the phrase of *Christ's Descending*
 in Soule: for as yet wee see no worde in all the whole
 Scripture any thing neere, much lesse equivalent thereto.
 If you will vrge that, where Christ is said to have ⁴ ben 3. dayes &
 3. nightes in the heart of the earth, there is nothing els then as
 before, even his Buriall. Your exception that ⁴ *Christ's sepulchre*
was in the higher parts of the earth frustrateth not the maner of
 the Hebrue phrase, after which the Scripture speaketh both here,
 and in the last before: as I ⁴ have declared plainly in my 1. Treatise.
 It seemeth, your not considering (or not caring for) the vs
 and maner of the Hebrue tounge causeth your mistaking as in
 these places, so likewise in all, or most of the rest: yea indeed it
 causeth your error in this maine questio, as after it will more ap-
 peare. Third, you ⁴ make much of that, which doeth you not a
 pinnes worth of good: where it is asked ⁴ *who shall descend into*
the deepe? that is, to bring Christ againe from the dead. If the deepe
 heere did signifie Hell, (which yet certainly it doeth not) but sup-
 pose it doeth: Howie will that follow: (which you presume) that
Christ dying descended into the deepe. The text saith no such thing.
 It saith he was with the dead, and that from thence he came: and
 therefore by this I rather conclude, it was thither only that he de-
 scended. Which also is signified elswhere in the same words, ⁴ *for*
the dead. Thus I say the dead heere importeth the generall condi-
 tion and state of all the Dead, as it is opposed to the state of the
 Living; and so it sheweth Christes lowest and last Humiliation, as
 the other places did before: saving that before his Grave particu-
 larly is intended, heere the state of death may bee applyed to his
 whole humane Person, and to both partes thereof dissolved. Yea
 it is not vnlikely that the former word *the deepe* is vsed also here
 by the Apostle to signifie (not Hell, but) even this condition and
 state of death which is as a Gulfe bottomles, never satisfied, & re-
 recoverable. Like as *Sbeol* in Hebrue doth likewise properly si-
 gnifie: as after we shall further declare. This meaning the Syriac
 Translator (an ancient writer, of no small credit) seemeth to have

ag. 312.

Mat. 12. 40.

ag. 312.

144. 146

1. 10.
ag. 349.
10. 7.

1. 10.

Abysm.

As he turneth it *Abyssum Sepulchri*, the deepe of the Grave. And then the deepe signifying heere the state and condition of Death; the Apostle seemeth to expresse his meaning to that effect more clearly in these next words, *this is to bring Christ againe from the dead*: that is, to frustrate Christes Death, wherevnto he descended for our sakes. We may consider also that this word heere the deepe many times is referred to the vast Gulfs & deepe pits of the earth, and likewise to the vnknown, deepe, and furthest partes of the sea. Now the Apostle may seeme to vse this large signifying word of purpose to expresse the infinit searching about of a incredulous and comfortles minde which seeketh iustice before God by the keeping of the Lawe. Who indeede thierby getteth nothing, but maketh void vnto it selfe the Gospell and all Christes benefits therein; His Death and Resurrection, his Ascension, &c. The Apostle then may insinuat in this word all these senses and significations thereof: namely I say, (with other) even such a seeking to the deepest and farthest partes of the Sea, to learne somewhere (if it might be) among all the Creatures of God how to fulfill and keepe the Law. For so Moses (whom heere he doeth cite) expressely signifieth: then so the Apostle also signifieth the very same. For these 3. things the Apostle delivereth heere together: 1. That the Law and the Gospell do greatly differ, & namely in that the Law doeth not save vs, but the Gospell doeth. 2. He sheweth the cause heereof, for that no flesh can keepe the Law, nor ever could: as he confirmeth by this out of Moses, where men thinking to live by the Law, are noted to seeke and search every where far and neere, by all wayes & meanes, that they might satisfie their own hearts, and finde how to keepe it: which proveth that their owne heartes beare witness that they keepe it not, neither can keepe it. 3. Hee sheweth that thus by seeking to live by the Law, they loose the life of God coming by Christes Death and Resurrection in the Gospell. Thus the Apostle rightly keepeth him selfe to the whole matter and meaning of Moses, whose wordes (though shortened) he citeth and discourseth vpon. But then it is not possible that the deepe heere should have any reference at all to Hell. For what colour is there to make a man pensive about keeping the Law to make him feel goe downe for him among the Diuells and damned spirits as being in sinne: but hee is to imagine that the keeping

of the Law might be rather there, then in his owne heart; or that any meanes might be got from thence to helpe men, that they might keepe it. There is no likelihoode for this out of doubt. Therefore also the deepe heere signifieth not Hell any way, seeing the Apostle doubtles retaynerh Moses sense, as is aforesaid. Lastly I may not omit to shew how you deale heere againe with the text. You alleage it ^a *He descended into the deepe*, all with speciall letters differing from the rest of purpose, to shew that *Christs descent into Hell* (for so you take the deepe) is found written in the very Scripture. But *He* is cunningly added to the text: neither are these words meant of *Him*, but of a Pharisaical *Meritwager*, searching everywhere for righteousness by works, as is before declared. The like practise ^c you vse againe in the Psalm: where the ^d text hath only *uent signah Sheol, If I lodge, or, if I spread my couch in Sheol, thou art there*. There is no word to expresse *beneath*, which you put into the text of your own head. The same also I noted in ^e you before. Somewhere you charge me (but ^f vainly) with falsifying of *Jerow*. If I had by oversight don so, yet that were not like this falsifying: which is not of men, but of Gods owne word; not by oversight, but of purpose for advantage.

These are all the Scriptures that can be brought, to make out the use of Christs Soule descending locally after his death. Which being abused to this purpose so palpably, as before we haue seene, I must in earnest say, *I marvelle that any will beleue it as an article of faith, that Christs Soule descended*: Specially considering our next reason which followeth.

Our 2. and most principall Reason is this: *If there bee not one place of Scripture to proue that Christs Soule was in Hell, then you ought to deny that opinion*. But you haue not indeed any one place that proueth it. Therefore it ought to be denied.

Against this Argument you ^e say you haue one place. Against. Euen only one, where you thinke it is plaine that Christ ^f *He* reioyeth because God would not leave *his soule in Hell*. But so you must haue it heere translated (in *Hell*) even because you will. But if men with reason resist your will, and proue vnto you that it bugh not to bee taken heere for *Hell*, then I pray tell me patiently, and vse not such raging & despisefull words, as you doe as if I were not worthy to be one of those men.

you speake of, vnlesse I would be bound to say your words. How
be it I beseech you giue vs leave. This sentence taken out of *Da-*
uids Psalmes & alleadged in the Actes, signifieth the very same
thing in both places. The Hebrew word controverted is *Sheol*,
the Greeke *Hades*. Now must the word *Sheol* and *Hades* needes
signifie *Hell*, being applied to soules departed hence? So indeede
you c avouch more confidently then truly: and heerevpon it see-
meth you d pawne the triall of this Question, saying, *Till we bring*
you some one good prooffe out of the Scriptures that the Soules of the
righteous before Christes comming were in Sheol or Hades, you will
rest in your opinion, that by this only plaine place Christes Soule
was in Hell. We hope then, when this prooffe (which you aske
for against your opinion) is shewed, you will correct your opinion
in this point. Let it therefore bee considered, I pray, which the
Psalmist also hath elsewhere of this matter. Let vs interpret the
Psalmes by the Psalmes. First this we observe in them, howe it is
written *What man liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver*
his soule from the hande of Sheol? Heere now the Soule attributed
to every man living, must be properly taken as well as in the for-
mer place, where you take it for Christs very Soule. For, *This rule*
must be helde throughout the Scriptures, that we divert not from the
native and proper significations of the wordes, but when the letter
impugneth the grounds of Christian faith and charitie. Otherwise
we shall leave nothing sound & sure in Gods word, if we may avoid
all things by figures that please not our humours. So long then as the
proper sense of the Scriptures may stand with the Analogie of faith
and direction of charitie, we offer violence to the word of God if we
wrest it to a figurative understanding. Now then it is apparant that
heere the soules of all men living, both good & bad (after death) are
appointed to *Sheol*. For there is none whosoever that can possibly
escape it, faith y text. Yet many good men there are & then were,
who could & did escape *Hell*. Therefore in the Script. *Sheol* and
Hades applied to departed soules, is not always *Hell*, but the *Con-*
dition or place, aswell where the iust mens soules are after death, as
that where the damed are. Wherefore we hope that you will keepe
your word, that is, to acknowledge *Sheol* and *Hades* may be ap-
plied to the Soules of iust and blessed men deceased. And withall
that Christes Soule after his death (having *Sheol* applied to it by

a Psal. 139
b Pag. 403.

c Pa. 139
403.
d Pa. 139

Sheol is
attributed
the Soules
just after
the Psal.

e Pag. 403.

† Much
in one
same W
in one
same m
and m
speake

the *Psalmist*, who applyeth the very same also to all iust mens Soules in the worlde when they dy) ought not therefore in any wise to be thought to have ben in Hell: even because he was the iustest and holiest man that ever was. Vnles some other scripture (more plaine then this) doe affirme it. Which because there is verily none, I say not one, that doeth leane any thing towards such a sense; therefore you ought not stilly to maintayne *that Christes Soule was locally in Hell*, as hitherto you haue done. But *Austin* collecteth this opinion from this place in the Actes. Oh, then this point of faith is grouded on *Austin*: it is his *collection* (not the text it self without him) that serves your turne. Certainly so it is. But this the agreeth not to your worthy protestations noted ^b before: this becometh not such good wordes. I beseech you, be not you of them *qui virtutē verba putās*. Then touching *Austins* authoritie, you know how you leave him, when you think good: regard not his ^d scant probable proofes, & coniecturall inclinations. Finally, that heere *Austin* hath no better then *scant probable proofes* and mere *coniectures*, we shall plainly declare (God willing) after we have shewed a generall consent and correspondence of all Authors for our sense of *Sheol & Hades*: which I hope presently you shall see.

But first you must note that we goe not about to prove *Sheol & Hades to be Heaven*. We never thought it, neither need we so to thinke. The more is your iniurie, when you haue nothing to improve, yet with scoffes, and floutes, & bitter reproches to disgrace me as you doe, and that even for this your owne meeke conceit. Neither yet can your ^e witty reason prove, that *Lumbus* heereby can not be avoided. Consider a word of like vse in Latin: *Defuncti* signifying *the Dead*, may be applyed generally to the Soules of men deceased. Yet notwithstanding this, I hope *Lumbus* may be easily avoyded. Alas I pray, are *Defuncti* none other but the Damned onely in Hell? The blessed in Heaven may be likewise called *Defuncti*, I suppose. Howbeit not in respect of their being in Heaven; but only in respect that they haue done with this life, and are gone hence. The word is properly generall: signifying in it selfe neither the blessed nor the Damned, neither to be in Hell nor in Heaven. Yet restrained by Circumstances (such as they may be) it signifyeth either. Certainly so doth *hades*, & also *Sheol*.

these (the Latin, the Greeke, and the Hebrew) wordes are indiffe-
rent and common in them selves, signifying in deed no positive
thing properly; but a meere privation of this life, and of a former
visible being heere sometime. And so it is, that the Psalmes saith,
Even the iust mens Soules, and all, must come to *Hades & Sheol*,
Moreover, thus in effect they are all one with *Thanatos*, Death;
but that *Thanatos* belongeth properly to Bodyes. *Hades & Sheol*
sometimes to Bodyes, sometime to Soules of Men indifferently.
Yea sometime these 2. are applyed (though more rarely) to other
things also which are in this visible world, namely wherthey com
to Destruction, and No being any more: as anon we shall better
vnderstande.

Now let vs proceed, and shew further even by the Scriptures
first, that *Sheol* and *Hades* are (as I say) more then once vled for
the generall condition of death wherein even iust mens soules are
held, or the mansion of soules departed as well good as bad. Then
afterward the common consent of others will avale the more.

That a Psalm which intreateth wholly of *Death*, of the impos-
sibility to escape it, of the power which it hath over the wicked
whose toy and pompe is only in this world, in that it curbeth of all
their hopes, it endeth their pleasure, and marreth all their bewty.
I say in this Psalm, where all expresse circumstances do shew that
the Prophet speaketh of this death, not of Hell, yet David heere
saith: "*notwithstanding God shall deliver my soule from the power
of Sheol (that is death, or the state of death) when hee shall receive
me most rightfully.*" So *Tremelius* turneth it, noting heere Da-
vids hope of the Resurrection, which I think he hath well vnder-
stood in this place. Otherwise David might heere comfort him-
selfe in this, that hee knew God would save him alive from this
common death, not *alwayes* as you frivolously object, but often-
times: yea alwayes till he should enjoy the Kingdome, which in-
deed God did for him when he was neere death not feldome, and
when his enemies & the wicked were caught therewith. Again,
that Psalm sheweth it also where it is thus written, "*My soule
is filled with sorrow, and my life draweth neere to Sheol.*" By his
life he meant his soule the proper cause and fountayne of life in
him, which also in the first parte of the sentence hee expressely na-
med. As the manner of phrase in the Psalmes is, in the 2. parte of

The proper
state of the
and Hades.

a Psalm

* ver. 1.

1. part

therefore he would goe to the soule of his sonne in *Sheol*. Or els vnderstanding heere the dissolution & passage of his Whole person, he may meane partly his *going downe* to the graue as touching his body, and yet also the enioying of the societie of his deare sonne in *Sheol*, which surely (as I said) could not bee in *body* but in *soule*. Thus *Sheol* heere hath respect to the changed estate of Iacobs whole person dissolved, and not to one parte thereof only, his body, but to his soule also: and it hath respect likewise to the estate of his dead sonnes *soule*, where this loving Father hoped againe to haue societie with him (not any where els) without which he could not be comforted. Albeit in another place it seemes hee limiteth *Sheol* to the graue only: but that we doe so vnderstand by reason of the Circumstances, *“you will bring my Gray Head with sorrow to the Grave.* But againe to follow our purpose: Good *hezekiah* also looked for *Sheol* to be his habitation likewise after this life. *“I said (saith “he) I shall goe to the gates of Sheol (the Land of the dead:) I shall not see the Lord in the Land of the living; I shall see Man no more among the inhabitants of the world: My habitation, or Mansion is translated and removed from me as a sheeps-heads sent, &c.* This heere cannot be the *Grave*, nor *Hell* which he describeth. For he thought he should the haue dyed: and thus his habitation he thought should haue ben removed and translated from him: that is, I take it, his body should be removed from his soule, which was the mansion or habitation of his soule while he liued, but now he should haue another age, “or induring, or Mansion, and be removed to another place. This can not be vnderstood of his Carcase, rotting and wasting away to nothing in the graue, and therefore indureth not as the word signifieth: therefore he meaneth it of his Soules removing and abiding elsewhere. Also he expressly opposeth *the Land of the living* to *Sheol*: therefore *Sheol* is *the Land of the dead*, not the *grave* only, nor *Hell* only, but as large and as generall to the dead, and as fit to receaue both the partes of men, yea both good and bad men, (but separated, and dissolved) as *the Land of the living* is to receaue both those partes united and knit together. Againe *hezekiah* was a godly man, therefore *Hell* was not for him: also though hee should not see the Lord in the Land of the living, which was the thing he desired, yet thereby hee seemeth to insinuate that in the Land of the dead hee might

Gen. 42.

“Hag. 38.
11, 12.

“Dut
aff. my
nations,
during
my malice

“Which
to be colle
of that he
Prophet
ing Christ
strid for
ed yron
Ioh. 53. 8.

might

they should prayse him much better, and more persitly in the next world.

To the very same purpose the *Septuagint* vsē *hades* in other places also, besides in their translating of these aforesaid. For it is truly and well acknowledged by you, & that both these wordes *Sheol* and *Hades* are iust all one. Now the *Septuagint* I say in other places do shew thus much also. ^h *If the Lord had not holpen me, my soule had almost dwelt in Hades:* in Hebrue it is in silence. Which is not meant of *hell* for there is weeping, and wayling, and ghashing of teeth: but of the state of death. Nor yet of the Grave, onely, because heere it is named to bee the *Habitation of the Prophets soules*, whither it was almost come when he was like to have dyed. Againe, ⁱ *My soule was filled with sorrowes, and my life drew neere to hades.* How my soule and my life heere, are taken for the selfe same, I have shewed before. As also in that of Iob, ^k *his life* (or soule) *is in hades*, in the world of the Dead.

Againe, it suffiseth for our purpose, that *Hades* and *Sheol* are often vsed even indifferently for *Death* and as being in effect the same, or for the state and Condition of Death, or the Power of Death. Which also sometime we may likewise conceave of the Latin *Inferi*: which is by the Translatours and other writers vsed for *Sheol* and *Hades*, though (I deny not) very daungerously and corruptly in deed. First, for ^a *misheol*, the Greeke hath *ek thanaton* from death, reckoning Death and *Sheol* to be all one. So in *Ecclesiastes* ^b *Sheol* and ^c *Hammechim* the dead are in effect all one. And the very same doeth *Esai* call ^d *Shagare Sheol*, the gates of *sheol*, which the ^e *Psalmes* and ^f *Iob* doe call *shagare maneth*, the gates of Death. In the ^g *Proverbes* he meaneth Death, not *Hell* nor the Grave strictly taken; where, by an excellencie the greedines of it is noted for being *Never satisfied*. For Death generally craveth more then either *Hell* or the Grave strictly taken, do. So likewise *Abakuk* coupleth them together as being in effect all one. ^h *Like sheol and Death it will not be satisfied*. Thus also it will appeare that that which ⁱ *David* reioyseth for, the very same in effect ^k *Christ* heere reioyseth for. Only with this difference, *David* reioyseth that God had delivered his soule from death the, when he was likely to have dyed: *Christ* reioyseth because God would deliver his soule from the Condition of Death (*sheol*) after he was

The Septuagint vsē Hades in 1 Samuel 28 Pag 40

h Psal 137 after the manner

i Psal 137 k Job 13

l Sheol Hades sed often only Death effect. Thence more.

a Prov 1

b Ecclesiastes c very d 115 e Psal 107 f Job 10

g Prov 10

h Abakuk

i Psal 137 k Psal 137

in it, & speedily even before his flesh should corrupt. This might be evidently shewed in infinit places mo, but that it is utterly needles. In this sense it is that the Reprobates and the Elect after death are said to be together. ^a *T a morrow thou & thy sons shalbe with vs*, saith the supposed Samuel to Saul. Not that there is any positive thing common to the Elect and Reprobates after death (which ^b you observe wel:) but only that they be alike dead, and alike remain in death. Yet I say, they are not like any further. This ^c *Anst.* very well sheweth whom you ^d bring: saith he, *mortuus mortem vivo prænuntiabat*: that is, *being dead he foreshewed death to him that yet lived*. So that it was the same condition of death both to *Saul* and *Samuell*, but not the same fruition of happines. Thus the old Latin Translatour vseth *Infernum*, as comonly for *Hades*, so sometimes for ^e *Thanatos* death, and sometimes ^f *Mors* death for *Hades*. *Epiphanius* readeth the ^g Text indifferently ^h *Thanaton* or ⁱ *Hadon*, as reckoning the in effect all one. *Iustin Martyr* long before, saith, ^k *Christ* a little before his death noted the folly of those men *ton nomiz. enton me einai auton Christon all began. menon thanatosein auton, kai hos keiron anthropon en hadon me. nein*: that thought him not to be *Christ*, but that he should dy and remaine in *Hades* as a common man. Hee meaneth not heere as a wicked man in Hell, but as any common man (whether good or bad) dying *abideth in Death*, or in the Dominion of Death, or in the world of the Dead. *Irenæus* saith, ^l *Heerein Christ* (*legem mortuorum servavit*) did but as others do that Dy, & conversed 3. dayes *ubi erant Mortui* (*sancti*) where the dead (*Saintes*) were. And this hee calleth *Locum invisibilem the vnscene World*. What meaneth this but *Hades*, as we take it? Yea a little before he expressly calleth it *Paradis*. Nevertheless I grant that he thought this *vnscene World* was indeed *beneath* in the earth: wherein his proofes do utterly faile him, as your selfe do fully grant, and professe in that point as well as wee. Again ^m hee further sheweth: that in the ⁿ Scripture he taketh *Hades* to be all one with *Death*, or the Dominion of *Death*, where he readeth the Text thus, *Absorpta est mors in victoriâ, ubi est mors aculeus inus? ubi est mors victoriam?* *Death is swallowed vp in victorie, Death where is thy sting? Death where is thy victorie?* And he addeth, *Hæc autem iussu centur tunc, &c.* These things shall truly be spoken then, when the

Sam. 28. 19

Pag. 396.

ad Simp. li.

quest. 3.

Pag. 209.

e Fathers

firme our

of Hades

A. 2. 24.

Cap. 15. 55

A. 2. 24.

Epiph. in

incephal:

Anchor.

stin. In

Th.

on. lib. 5.

vii.

an invi.

place of

Hades.

JA 11

lib. 5. 13.

A. 38.

on. 15. 55

Greek.

ales.

16.23 that he maketh Hades and Inferos even in ^a *Luke* also, to be no
 thing but the common state and world of the Dead. Whereupon
 the learned *Iunius* noteth thus, *Observandum autem quod ait*
Apud Inferos etiam de Lazaro. Nam inferos Latini Patres
(ut Graci Haden) pro omni loco aut statu mortuorum dixerunt
promiscue. Atq; in hunc sensum Lazarus & Dives apud inferos
collocantur. Quomodo ^b *Irenaus, & c* *Chrysostomus ex verbis Luc.*
 16.23. locuti sunt, & *Tertullianus* locis quamplurimis. This
 therefore it is that *Tertullian* saith in another place, ^d *Constituimus*
omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem iudicii: We
determine that every mans Soule is kept apart in the worlde of the
dead til the day of iudgment. And, Are all soules thē in the power of
the kingdom of Death, penes inferos? Will you will you, there you
shall finde punishments and comfortes, as in Lazarus and the Rich
man. For why should you not thinke that the Soule may be both pu
nished and comforted in inferis, in the Worlde of the dead? Neither
doth he ^e *Montanize* in this (as ^f you object) but consenteth with
Irenaus before and with others after him as shall appeare, who
 were no *Montanists*. Notwithstanding it is true, that somewhere
 he taketh inferos, pro locali determinatione (as he speaketh) for the
 peculiar and determinat place of the wicked deceased, that is, Hell
 strictly and properly. Thus he doth in that ^g against *Marcion*, wh
 you cite pag. 201. Also in that ^h objection of certaine *Hærenikes*
 whom hee confuteth, not the true Christians, as ⁱ you ^k miscon
 ceave. They argued thus (as you do) in hoc *Christus Inferos adiit;*
ne nos adstramus. Christ therefore went to Hell, to the ende that we
might never come there, He answereth them that it is false that
Christe went to Inferos in that sense, that is to Hell: for then what
difference is there betweene the wicked Heathens and the godly
Christians, if one & the same prison after death were for them both.
 Taking it for a thing generally granted in the church, that *Christ*
 being dead went onely thither where the godly Dead were, and
 therefore that it were a wicked and *Hæreticall* thing to thinke he
 went where the Damned were, that is into Hell. And so he quite
 overthroweth your opinion together with the reason thereof,
 as an opinion, whiche if any helde, they were ill thought of in
 those dayes. Thus also is ^j *Augustin* well understood, where he
 denyeth that the Patriarkes were apud inferos, in Hell, namely the
 place of the Damned, because they were in *Abrahams bosom*.

before
 162.
 om de
 ik.
 anima,
 55.

Irenaus
 on this
 chap.
 188.

anima
 55.

188.

title of
 booke in
 edition.

De
 ad lit.
 13.

Which yet ^b selfwhere he graunteth vnto, that they might be ^a *apud inferos* in the world of the Dead, & namely where the Godly dead should be. So that thus if you had but distinguished these and other Fathers like words as you ought to haue done, there needed no such folly of Contradiction to be imputed vnto them, as ^c you doe lay to their charge in this point, altogether vnderstandedly. Which being well observed you shall see that all the Fathers (as *M^r Iunius* saith) both Greeke & Latin, do take *Hades* and *inferos* indifferently for the state of the Dead, as wel pertainning to ^d Soules of the Godly, as to the Damned likewise. *Athanasius* also saying ^e *ubi tenebatur anima humana in morte, ibi exhibuit humanam suam animam: Where Humane Soules were held by Death, there he brought his humane Soule*, Meaneth nothing els but that his humane Soule came vnder the same condicion of death, as other mens Soules did: not that he went to the place of the Dāned. Neither must he be vnderstood after ^f your partiall translation, but after his owne language the Greek. When you say *ex Orco*, out of Hell, him selfe saith *ex hadon*, out of the power of Death. So that ^g hee saith not a word that Christ was in Hell, but onely that his Soule was in *Hades*, in the Dominion of Death, as ^h other good mens Soules were also: whence he by his victorious returne conquering Death ⁱ brought vs immortalitie, and wrought resurrection for vs. Heere *Hades* being ennemy and opposit to the Immortalitie and Resurrection of mens persons, cannot by any meanes be Hell: For Hell agreeth with Immortalitie and Resurrection, & in Hell shall be immortalitie and resurrection as well as in Heavē. But it is the common Death and dissolution of our persons, which is contrarie to the immortalitie and resurrection of them. For as Resurrection is nothing els but a restoring and reuniting of the Soule to the Body, so the contrarie is nothing els but meere the dissolution and separation of the Soule from the Body: which is Death, and not Hell. Now in this death (saith *Athanasius*) Christ was held till he spoyled and conquered it; thereby giving vs resurrection and immortalitie. This can not be Hell out of questiō. *Hilarius* verily hath this meaning also, saying; ^k *This is the Law of humane necessitie, that their bodies goe down to the Grave, their Soules to the world of the Dead, ad inferos. Which descent the Lords did not refuse, that he might prove him selfe in every point to bee a true*

^b Epist. 5.
De civi. D.
20. 13.

^c Pag. 182.
300. 304.

^d Promiss.

^e Athanas.
incor. Ch.

^f Pag. 179.
186. 214.

^g De salu.
vent. Ch.

^h Ad rom.
similitud.

ⁱ De salu.
advent. C.
sti.

^k Hilari.
Psal. 139.

man. His going to Hell proveth him not to be a true man: but his Soul to com vnder the power of Death, as well as his body to com to the Grave, that right well proveth him in deed to have bene a true man, and wholly in nature like all other men. Also this was indeed the Lawe of humane necessitie, (after the like phrase as ^a Justin, ^b Irenaeus, and ^c Tertullian also speake:) but not to goe to Hell. Now this Death properly beløgeth to the Body of Men; ^d as it is left without life. Also no lesse properly it beløgeth to the whole Person of men, as it is dissolved and destroyed thereby. Thirdly, by consequence it beløgeth to both the dissolved partes: yea even to the immortall Soule (though blessed; not as it is in blessednes, but) as it remayneth held from the Body by the force of Death. And so all these last named are very excellent places to prove (which afterward I shall further shew) that all those articles of the Creed *He Dyed, was Buryed, and descended to Hades* do indeed signifie but one thing in effect, *that he was a true man*: seeing thus it befell him as it doeth all other men by the Law of our Nature: that is, *to Dye*. And therefore that it was cleane left out in all ancient Creedes, (where both those other clauses are specified) as being no divers point in effect from *Dead* and *Buryed*. Which Creedes nevertheles are worthily deemed to be absolute and perfitt touching Christes workes of Redemption which hee hath wrought for vs. Since perhaps, when it came into the Common Creed, they signified heereby Christes going to *Limbus*. Which opinion indeed men generally inclined vnto (though erroneously) for many yeares: yet that the Ancients put this *Descending to hades*, (meaning Limbus, or howsoever) into the vulgar Creed distinctly from both the other foresaid clauses, I beleue not. The contrary is proved afterwarde: as anon we shall see. But to proceed heere: ^e Chrysostom and ^d Basill likewise (with the rest of the Greeks) may be noted, how they yeeld *Hades* to the Soules of the godly and iust men deceased remayning in ioyes. Also Ambrose is to be considered, who right according to all the rest, saith, ^e *Soules departed from their Bodes did go to Hades*, that is, *to an invisible place, which in Latin we call Infernum*. And Jerome, ^f *Infernus is a place where the Soules are included, either in rest or paines*. And Rufinus *υπό τὸ Descendit ad inferna* giveth this sense *Descendit in Mortem, He submitted vnto Death*. All the rest which ^h you cite (or can cite) haue nothing contrary, but rather

Id. keinos
brōpos.

egem mor-
tuo serva-

egi satisfe-
formā hu-
ma mortis
fuit.

ag. 157.
efore.

Death &
es are v-
lar & same.

ryf. Hom.

vit & de

bol. Tom.

in 1. Cor.

Hom. 40.

fil. in

42.

abr. de

mort.

ro.

om. in

1. 14.

ffin. in

bol.

413-414

confer-

consenting heerewith. So that it is certaine by all the Fathers generally, 1. That *Hades* and *Sheol* are taken for *Death*, the *Common state of Death*, or the *invisibile world of the dead* common to the Souls both of good and bad, though their particular places were far separat and distinct. 2. That Christ went not into Hell the place of the Damned, as you holde: but to the Habitation of the blessed deceased (called also by them *Abrahams bosome*;) which we knowe (and you also) was indeed Heaven: according to that worde of Christ, "*I leave the Worlde, and goe to the Father*". Which I have prooued further before, pag. 149. 150. I doubt not but they erred generally (as "your selfe also holdeth) in thinking that this Habitation of the blessed Souls was *beneath* in the earth, or that it was not *heaven*: nevertheles this is the point wherein we agree, and wherein they erred not, and which I cite them for, and which is directly against you, that *hades* (which also is *sheol*) belonged to the Blessed soules deceased, as well as to the Damned: and namely that Christes going to *Hades* was to go to the Blessed deceased. Which in Latin also they called *Infernū*, but so vnproperly and so vnaptly in respect of the truth, that even this ill terme surely both sprang from error, and began in them their error, or confirmed and spread farther this error.

Now thus your vaine boasting of "all the Fathers is but a bubble: and that *All the Fathers without exception do touch and teach Christes locall Descent to hell*. So that if you bee content (as "you say) to be tryed by all the Fathers Greeke and Latin, they quite overthrow you, notwithstanding your great words. For the truth is, they are all against you: and with vs, in such sort as I said. Only *Austin* doubtingly and waveringly differeth from all the rest: who somewhere seemeth to think that *Inferi* cannot be attributed to iust mens Soules departed. For thus doubtingly he speaketh, "*Ilud me nondum inuenisse confiteor &c. I confesse I have not yet found that Inferi are named where the iust mens Soules are at peace*. Yes surely the Ancientes named the places for all the deceased both good & bad *Inferos*, like as they named (where both wicked and good do live in the world) " *Superos*. And *Austin* (if hee had marked it well) might have founde even this (which he saith hee found not) in the Latin translation of the Scripture: "*Quis est homo, qui vivet, &c. What man is there that (ever) shall live and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his Soule from the hande of Inferi,*

Note.

" Ioh. 16. 16.

" Pag. 149.

" Pag. 49.

" Pag. 49.

c Aug. de ad luct. ca.

d Ambr. Phil. 1. 17. " Plu. 20. Lat. edn.

that is Death. For he can not heere vnderstand *Inferi* to bee the Grave, because then the Soule must signifie the dead body: which you say is more then absurd. Wherefore the Soule heere being taken properly for the Soule, then *Inferi* is found applyed to iust mens Soules deceased, as well as to the wicked: which *Augustin* might have observed. Yea he him selfe ^b elsewhere graunteth also that the iust in peace might be in *inferi* after death. And heere he denyeth it but coldly & waveringly, *Proinde ut dixi nondum inveni, & adhuc quæro, nec mihi occurrit inferos alicubi in bono posuisse Scripturam.* Now this is *Austins* difference heerein: let the Reader iudge, if you say truly that *Austin* indicially and resolutely affirmeth it. Or is it not rather (as I call it) his *Cōiectural* inclination: yea his only. For *Fulgentius* denyeth not *inferos* to the godly deceased, nor that Christ was locally with them onely in *inferis*. So that in saying, He was where the wicked are tormented, he meaneth that in respect of the Cōmon place; which in whole hee calleth *infernum*. Thus then we may see that *Austins* differing heerein is to little purpose. 1. Because it is contrary to all the auncient Fathers before him, with him, and since him. 2. Because we must not esteeme his saying by the Latīn *Inferi*, but by the originall *Sheol* and *Hades*, which are more against him: as before I have shewed. 3. Because it is waveringly delivered, & with doubt in him selfe; yea contrary to him selfe, as I have shewed. 4. Because he seeketh to maintaine it erroneously. For he giveth this reason and end of Christes going to Hell (the place of the Damned) that he might deliver some of the damned sinners out of Hell torments, *quos esse solvendos occultâ suâ iusticiâ indicabat.* Which most strange conceit of his your selfe ^c doe confute rightly. But either graunt this end and reason to be true, or els say his maine opinion is false also, that Christ went thither: seeing he maketh that the reason of this. And why may not *Austin* erre as well in saying that he went to Hell after death, as in saying that he went thither to loose out of paines such and such? It seemeth *Austin* was carried into this conceit, because hee could not imagine what els Christ should doe in Hell: and that he was there in deed he thought, because he ghesse (contrary to all antiquity besides) that the meaning of *inferi* and *hades* could not be applyed to the estate of blessed soules after this life. Which mistaking of his

Pag. 168.

Epist. 17.
e civit Dei,
p. 15.Pag. 169.
Dei ore pa.
56.
Pag. 175.

Pag. 199.

Et neq; fru-
strâ illuc de-
scendisse exi-
timetur nulli
eorum profu-
erunt qui ibi
erant. Epist.
79.

also yours with him) is plentifully convinced (I hope.) before
 Wherein I desire the learned to iudge. As for *Austin* opposing
 against this our sense of *Hades*, saying: *In græcâ lingua origo no-*
minis quo appellatur inferi, ex eo quod nihil suave habeant, resonare
perhibetur. It sheweth his mistaking more: yea the very grounde
 of all his mistaking, as I thinke. First it appeareth by this, that
Austin had very litle knowledge in the Greeke: seeing hee thin-
 keth that *Hades* should originally signify *nihil suave*, nothing
 sweet, and a the *Privative*. Wherein then he misleth much: for
hades in Greeke hath alwayes *iôta* written vnder, which sheweth
 that in the true originall whence *hades* cometh, there is the letter
iôta expressed. But in *hedy's* sweet there is none. The trueth is, it
 cometh from *uis* to see, and a the *privative*: as all Græcians (*Pla-*
to, Plutarch, &c.) yea the Fathers, *Irenæus, Tertullian, Ambrose,*
&c.) do shewe: and that it signifieth, *An invisible state after a vi-*
sible being in this world, and sometime *Darknes*, or a place of dark-
 nes. Not that the state of all the Dead generally was thought to
 be in darknes, but because Death tooke them out of this cheere-
 full worlds light, and covered them (as it were) with darknes and
 oblivion from the worlds sight and knowledge heere. This ety-
 mologic of *hades* was most familiar and frequent with all Gree-
 cians, with whom it seemes *Austin* was not much acquainted: as
 by this his wide coniecture we may thinke. Neither impure this
 (I pray) as arrogancie to me, for so iudging of such a man, I think
 all men will so iudge of him likewise, and yet detogat nothing
 from his great desert in Gods Church. Him self doth soberly ac-
 knowledge it of him selfe, saying, "*Ego quidem Græcâ lingua per-*
parum affectus sum, & propè nihil. Truly I have but litle Greeke:
yea almost none. Neither would he heere have said *perhibetur*, thus
 it is reported, touching the Etymologic of *Hades*: if he had pretē-
 ded any skill in that tounge. Yea *Possidonius* in his Life testifieth,
 that he had no love to the Greeke language. Besides many other
 argumentes heereof, if it were likely that I wronged him in iud-
 ging thus of him. Wherefore seeing it was thus, no marvaile if
Austin easily mistooke the proper & right meaning of *hades*: &
 then much sooner of *Inferi*, for the reason before noted. Thus
 also he might readily imagin heerevpon, that *Hades* and *Inferi* (in

The nature
Hades.

Cont
Petil. 3

Page
Treat
103

Scripture specially) were no where applyed to blessed Soules. Which oversight in him is much more pardonable, when it can be in you: who I doubt not in the languages want no skill; if you would but sincerely iudge according to that you do vnderstand. Yea and in comparison of my selfe, I vnfeignedly confesse, that I suppose I haue not seene many bookes in the learned tounes, which you are likely to haue read and studied. Nevertheless I am well assured that in the sense of these words *Hades* and *Sheol*; you are greatly overshoot: and most of all in this vnfavoury opinion coming therefrom, that Christes soule after death went to Hell. As I hope it hath hitherto well appeared. Yet you will say, *Aust.* speaketh marveilous resolutely, that *"None but an infidell will denie that Christes Soule was in inferis.* So he may well, vnderstanding heere *Inferos* to expresse *Hades* in Greeke: for that is the Scripture in deed. Which to denie were infidelitie. But hee is no infidell that denieth *inferos* to be a fit Latin worde for *Hades* in Greeke: or admitting the translation, yet denyeth in English that Christ was in Hell. After all, yet I may not forget how *Aust.* heere "would haue in this cōtroversie the very nature & proper Etymologie of *Hades* to be regarded and precisely followed: notwithstanding that him self mistooke it much. How then is it, that you skornfully cal this indeavour (touching the Hebrue *Sheol*) *Rabbinicall Grammar observations*, and (touching *Hades* in Greeke) *the Poets fantastickall imaginations*? In this therefore *Aust.* also is not a litle against you. Other exceptions of his touching the matter, we shall afterwards consider together with yours.

Now I come from the Ancients to the later learned Writers: that we may not neglect their iudgment in this question. Who as they were generally freer from error then those of olde for the most part, so they testifie this point with me more cleerly & more constantly then they. Who were observed before. Yet because you let them go without (as it were) saluting them, and as if they were not worthie (belike) that you should cast a looke on them: therefore they shalbe noted once more, that I may presse you with the, and that others at least wise, may consider them better. *Bac.* saith, *The Scripture no where speaketh of Hades or Infernum, but as being common as well to the blessed as to the damned. But Gehenna is proper only for the damned.* Again, *In that we acknowledge*

pist. 99.

Some have
d it simply
the state
ath. pa.
3. &c.
a Graca
ma origo
inis, &c.

g. 153.

late De
ons of the
well con-
our ex-
aut.

cat. 1.

in Mat.
50.

ledge

ledge that the Lord went down to Infernū, we understand that in his Soule he dyed to the society of the foules of the dead Saints, even as in his body hee was ioyned to their bodies by Buriall. P. Martyr, That Christ descended to Inferos (or Hades) signifieth nothing els, but that he did undergoe the same state as other soules do that depart this life. Mollerus, (touching Sheol, Hades, and Infernum ascribed to Christ) saith, they do signifie but that Christ dyed: and to be no more, then as if he should say in the Psalme, Therefore I rejoyce because I know that although I dy, yet I shall rise to life againe. Bulinger (speaking of Christ & indifferently of the godly) sheweth that To go to Inferos, is to go to Abrahams bosom, that is into Heaven, not into Hell: and that Inferi and Hades do make difference only betweene the Living and the Dead, & nothing els. Lavater saith, ^a Hades in Greeke is a generall worde for the condition of the dead both in torments and in peace. Tremellius saith, ^b This Hebrew word Sheol doth signifie any station or state of the Dead in generall in very many places of Scripture: and Hell it may sometime signifie, but by a figure synecdoche. Lastly Iunius in his note vpon Tertullian ^c before rehearsed, doth confirme all this most fully. These men I thinke every wise and faithfull Christian will highly esteeme and prefer, for their learning and namely for their skill in the tounge, for their sincerity and soundnes in Religion, for their vnity and consent in this point, for their diligence, faithfulness, and modesty in all thinges.

The rather this sense of Hades we are to acknowledge, because it hath ben the ancient phrase and common vse of speech before Christianity: that this worde should signifie the generall state of Death applyed even to the Soules both of the Blessed & Damned. Which sufficiently I shewed before out of Plato, Homer, and others. Yea no lesse I shewed also touching the Latin worde Inferi out of Cicero, though this word naturally implyeth an error, which Hades doth not, as before also I have declared. What is your answer to this? Forsooth (I thinke because you have ben a master of Grammar) you go about to teach Cicero Latin, & for his general phrase implying that al the Deceased both good & bad were *apud Inferos* you do so whip him & handle him & heere, that it seemeth you forget by whom your selfe hath profited, and that even he in this past hath ben your Teacher. I will not now enter into any

a P. Martyr
Symbo.

b Mollerus
Psal. 116

c Bullinger
1. 7. & 8.

d Lavater
Ezech. 37. 12.
e Annorum
Psal. 49.

f Pag. 10

The learn
Heathen
thought
our Hades.

“ Treat.
97. 98.

“ Pa. 100.
108.

8 Year
107.

defense of *Cicero*: his speech and language will defend it selfe.
 Also that were to leave our maine purpose. But it is the lesse
 strange that you vse *Cicero* thus: for others also have had the like
 correction at your handes with him. ^aBefore *Terence* (scaped not.
 And ^b heere *Plato* and *Socrates* and other Greekes have also their
 partes, for their vsing and taking of the Greeke worde *Hades* so
 largely as the naturall Etymologie thereof doeth beare. But let
 them defend them selves whether they speake vsuall and right
 Greeke and Latin, or no: I will leaue them in that. They are elo-
 quent enough, they can speake in this case for them selves. Only
 I will take their wordes at their handes even as ^cI finde them, and
 so I refer the iudgement of all to the learned and wise Reader.
 Also for that charge against me of ^dlewd lying, and open falsify-
 ing of *Plato*, I remit all to the indifferent Reader. Yet I can not
 but smile truly (for offended I will not be) that Mai. *Bilson* is so
 strongly perswaded, that ^eI am of *Platoes* and *Ciceroes* religio tou-
 ching Hell, Heaven, the Gods, and wicked Spirites: and that I
 seeke indeed to bring in their fantastickall *Hell* into our *Christian*
Creed. This fantastickall conceit of his, let him feed him selfe with
 it: and let him perswade it to whom he can. Thus much the so-
 ber and indifferent Reader will consider and acknowledge, that
 the Holy Apostles doe teach the Heavenly truth with the very
 wordes and Grammar of the Heathen men: wherevnto that ser-
 veth which is written of them, ^f*We every man heare them speak*
in our owne tongues and languages wherein we were borne. Then
 the Apostles surely spake according to the currant speech before
 their times and in their times, and yet thereby never ^g*can-*
nized the fables and fancies which the nations implied in their
 wordes. Whosoever he be that will say otherwise, knoweth not
 what he saith: neither shall any credit or greatnes which he hath,
 get him credit in so saying. Yet in a certaine place you most
 strangely and confidently avouch, ^h*That neither with the ancient*
Maisters of the Greeke tongue which were Poets, nor with the
nor with the Writers of the New Testament, nor with the people of
that time Hades did ever signifie the world of Soules without any
mimutation of state or place. I thought that those fewe allegories
 which ⁱI brought of *Plato*, *Plummer*, and ^k*Plutarch* for the
 Greeke, and of *Latins* for the Latin would have sufficed to con-

1510.

1374-378

also all
 forenoted
 med Wri-
 have toid
 in & vied
 likewise.
 185.

1370.

1389.

138, 11.

1368.

1410.

1. Treat.

137. 98.

no in

done.

in illud.

church.

collet. &

vifol. ad

you not to deny so cleere and manifest a trueth, which heere you denie even against your owne knowledge, as after shall appeare. Wherefore to demonstrat this point a litle further to you, and to al men, if any yet doe believe this your assertion, (which is most vntue) I will not thinke it to much to note some more places out of the Heathen authentike Greekes, (for that is the principall con- troversie) that Hades with the did signifie the world of Soules, with out any limitation (in the very word it self) either of state or place. But as all men know that by reason of Circumstances it often sig- nifieth with the Hell determinatly, so by reason of circūstances al- so it signifieth with them many times determinatly the Habitiatiō of the Soules of good men in ioyes and pleasures, which was to them as their Heaven. And for this I will only put you in minde of some places, which you know well enough already. First note that common epithet or title of Hades: *Hades pandokeus* or *pandochus*. The vnscene worlde or state of Death that receaveth all, both good and bad. ^bOthers imagin Hades a God or mighty power of Death, & do cal him, *enerosin kataphthimenoisin anasson*, Ruler (not of Hell only, but) of all that Dy. And therefore to this place com not the wicked and damned onely, but the noblest and best also, (as *Achilles* saith being dead and being in Hades) *Aidos de katelshemen entha te nekroi*: Hither into hades all we that are dead do come. This ^dPlato and *Plutarch* do acknowledge in that place which ^eyou cite at large: together with a number mo both of the Poets & Philosophers. And this also it is that *Homer* shewing how *Iupiter* cast down his rebellious Angels into Hell (*Tartaron*, with them the proper place of the Damned) hee describeth it to be so much beneath Hades the place of the other Dead, *eboson ou- ranos esti apo gais*: as heaven is from the earth. So in regard of this it is that *Sanother* maketh it to be much better to be in *hades*, as it is the common place and condicion of the dead (not Hell) then to be sicke vnrecoverably: *kreisim aida kenthon enasōn ma- ran*. And so *Plutarch* maketh Hades (not Hel, but) the place of the Dead or the state of the dead in generall to be a soveraigne com- for to the afflicted & miserable in this world, ^h*O Thanate paian ietras maloi*. *Limen gar ontas aidas an' aian*: Aiden & echon bo- zom, *en tremskias*. Lastly that which ⁱyou bring of *Orphens* de- scribing the true God, that he is King both of the Vnscene world

Note.

Hades the worlde of Soules
Authenticke Greekes
a Lycoph.
b Hom.
c Hom.
λ.

d Plato
Gorgias
Plutarch
Consol.
Apollon
e Pa. 37

f Hom.

g Sophoc.
Aiant.

h Plutarch
Sering.
Æthy.

i Pag. 17

aithēros ed' aidon, and also of this present visible worlde *pontos gairēste tyrannos*, confirmeth all that is before said. For *aither aidon* heere is to be construed together, not separatly; and so he signifieth thereby that the true God indeed is Lord and King not only over this whole Visible world (which he vnderstandeth by the *Sea and Land*) but also over the whole *Invisible world* or *ayer*, that is over all the Dead both good and bad. I marvaile therefore very much what you meane to speake so plainly contrary to the truth and to your owne knowledge, that Hades did never signifie the *World of Soules without any limitation of state or place*, no not with the ancient Maisters of the Greeke toung which were the Poets. The rather this your speach is directly against your knowledge because you expressly collect and confesse the contrary, that is the same which I do: thus you say. *Hades before (the Apostles time) extended to good and bad. And "within Plutoes kingdom under the earth which they call Hades, as well the places and pleasures for the Good, as the prisons and punishmentes for the bad are in their conceit prepared and settled. Againe, Hades with them was the Ruler or place of Soules, were they in rest or paine. Where you make a strange answer, that Christian Religion will assure, that this place must needs be Hell. What? That place where some good mens soules deceased are in rest? Is this Hell? Yea is it Hell in Christian Religion? Who then henceforth will care for Hell, if some soules haue rest and pleasures in Hell? But you say also that those Heathen Greekes did thinke that this place of Soules was under the Earth. It is true, they thought so in deed: and it was their error, as also the very same was the Christian Fathers errour likewise. Which they drew certainly from their acquaintance with those Heathens, but no where at all from the Scriptures. Yet none of these thought this place to be very Hell, where soules were in rest. There is small rest, and few pleasures in Hell. But these Heathens vnderstood Hades chiefly for Plato the Ruler of this place vnder the earth. So that though the place were also called Hades, yet this was but secondarily. I answer: This is questionles very vntue. For rather the Place or the Estate of the Dead was first originally called *Hada*. The God thereof (whom afterward they idolatrously imagined) they did conceave secondarily in respect of the place or thing. Which beside the evidence of the*

ag 403.

ag. 371.

ag. 379.

d, in Ho-
d, Virgil,
istophanes
ripides and
ers you shal
the World
the Dead,
the world of
les be they
for bad ro
in Plutoes
gdū which
Greeks
as call
Hades.

-379. 381

Hades it
is impor-
g no such
ng.

371. 374

am perswaded that *Plato & Plutarch* do shew also plaine enough, even heere where you cite them. Howsoever: this is not material, nor to any purpose, whether the *place* and *state* were with the first and chieflie called *Hades*, or whether the fayned *Power of death*, and *Ruler of the Dead* (as they imagined) were first and principally so called. This is certaine, that this *Power* or *Ruler* which they conceived to be over the Dead, as they like Idolators made it a *God*, so their meaning was to esteeme him as the *God of the Dead* in Generall, and his *state* and *kingdome* to be the *Habitatio* of the Dead in generall, not of the wicked only in Hel, but of the good also in their Elysian happines: which was to them in their estimation and reckoning, that which Heaven indeede is to vs.

But "you say, there is *no one place in truth common to all soules* departed this life, but som are in Hel, and som in Heaven. I doubt not but the blessed in Heaven & the Damned in Hell are both in condition & situation seperated a sunder exceeding far. Yet nevertheless as they are somewhere wthin the cōpasse of the created world so they are in a cōmon place; opposit indeed to this visible earth & world of the living, but cōmon to al the Dead, namely in this only respect as they are Dead & departed hence, & are vnscene, & vterly exempted frō all mutual meddling together with vs that do live. Moreover we stande not so much on this, that by *Hades* must be vnderstood any one place cōmon to all the Dead; but *the State and condition of death* among the Dead, or *the Power and Dominion of Death* which very aptly also it serveth for, and fitteth our purpose as well as to vnderstand thereby a *common place*. But indeed all this I doubt not *Hades* very well may signifie, when it is referred to men, according to the circumstances of the authour where it is read. But this *Hades* you say in those Heathen authors "is the very Divell himselfe. Therefore his Kingdome must beeedes *nothing but Hell*. I answer, The Heathen in their conceit thought him not to be a Divell but a * *God*, even the God and Ruler over all the Dead: and so they worshipped this foule Idoll. Therefore his whole kingdome & region they reckoned to be the *World of the Dead or Dominion of Death*, which also they called *Hades*: It may be ^f *Porphyrie* meaneth that they held him to be Lord and Ruler over Hell and all the wicked Spirits and Divells therein: yet he saith not but that *Hades* or *Pluto* was thought by them

e Which
ing a pri
pall poin
our qu
is fully g
ted by
before.
" Pag. 39

" Pag. 378. 40

* Vrs. 3
or of d
w by
is some
signific

f Pag. 39

them to have power over all the Dead: his *rage* against men, and the *fear* that men had of him, signified the *unmercifulnes* of *Death* sparing none, and how it is to the nature of all men a *thing* most terrible. So that they esteemed a *part* indeed of his Dominion to be Hell peculiarly: but a *part* also to be the Region of the Happy, which was their Heaven. But you say, this was the Divell. Yea even as the rest of their Gods were also very Divells indeed, & nothing els. So was their Highest *Jupiter*, and so was *Apollo*, and so was *Mercury*, and all the rest of the Goddes and Goddesse which their impiety adored. They were indeede none other, then very Divells illuding the vanity of men. And thus I grant was their *Hades* or *Pluto* likewise. Howbeit in their estimation he was not properly the Divell, but a Power or Ruler over the Dead both good and bad: and his Kingdom the Dominion and world of the Dead both good and bad. But ^{pag. 171.} you remit *Poets and Pagans* using this word to the alleagers. Yet Poets & Pagans are the authentike maisters for Grammar both Greek & Latin. Yea they were yours I doubt not in time past. ^{Before pag. 170.} *Austin* (as we saw) alloweth the Etymologic and naturall propertie of *hades* to be regarded. Yea all learned men in all ages condemne this your reiecting of Pagans and Poets for the Grammaticall vse of wordes: whom still they do regard and follow in this respect.

But heere let vs observe, how the holy Apostles doe teach the truths of the Gospell with the very wordes and language of the Heathens. ^{Observations.} There are in this point 3. or 4. thinges that must be well observed and remembred. 1. The Apostles doe speake of the mysteries of true Religion with the Heathens wordes (as I said) yet so, as that when the Heathens wordes do imply some error with truth, then in other expresse places they plentifully refute al their errorrs implied in their wordes. Whereby it comes to passe that all the proportion of truth which the Heathen signified by them, is yet fully and rightly signified still in the Apostles vse of them but nothing further, that is, none of the other fancies & fictions of the Heathen. As for example, *Jeu* *Jupiter*, was among the Heathens their great God, & he only was their highest: of whom besides they held a 1000. fables, and indeed he was none other but a Divell, as is before noted. Nevertheles the Apostle vseth the same for the only true *God* the author and governour of Heaven.

and Earth (passing by all their fables) when he applyeth the Po-
 ets worde, *This generation also we are* *Tartarus* which you ob-
 iect, though rarely & sometime perhaps a Philosopher will note
 thereby the *Ayer*, yet indeed usually and in a maner alwayes they
 meant *Hell* by it, with a thousand of dreames thereto belong-
 ing. Yet Peter not canonizing nor commending their dreames
 and fictions of Hell, notwithstanding signifyeth *Hell* indeed by
 that worde of theirs according to their common vse thereof, and
 according to the proportion of truth which therein they held. So
Daimonion, which also you object they vsed to signifie by it
 both good and bad Spirits following and conversing with them:
 and the good they honoured as Gods. But indeede and in truth
 seeing these same were all Diuels, therefore the Scripture holdeth
 not the Heathens erroneous meaning in this word: yet it doth re-
 tayne that which they vnderstood by it truly, that is to signifie
 Diuells and bad spirits. Again, *Thees* the Heathen vsed for to
 expresse the Nature of God: but so as that they thought it comon
 to many severall Gods. The Apostles vse the word also for the true
 God, yet not vnderstanding therein a nature common to many:
 which error they otherwise cleerely and often refute. And thus
 we might speake of infinit mo the like wordes: as *Fears*, the pow-
 er and strength whereof they also fained to be a God, and of *Hops*
 and of *Revenge* Goddesses, &c. Like wherevnto is *Hades*, even
 that which presently we have in hande. With the Heathen it com-
 monly and most usually signified the state of *Dead men*: sometime
 rarely, the *Destruction of other things* which perish out of this vi-
 sible world & haue no more being heere. Whereof anon we shall
 see further. Howbeit now to consider it as it respecteth men only,
 thus the Heathens chiefly and commonly by *Hades* vnderstoode
 the state I say and Condition of men both good and bad deceased
 and gone out of this world. And they meant it commonly for the
 Destruction of their persons from out of this world generally and
 indifferently. Again, oftentimes particularly touching their Bo-
 dies buriall: also particularly many things touching their Soules
 state being parted from the Body. Some of which they believed
 were in *Blessednes*, some in *Torment*: although they signified
 neither of these in the word *Hades*, but onely (as I said) their state
 after their departure hence. Also they thought some of the Blessed
 Soules

a Ad. 17
b Pag. 10

c Pag. 10

The diu
applic
of Hades

177
177
177

Which you
sied pag.
74-376.

FROM: 1. pa.
7.

Soules to be in the ⁴ chiefest Blessednes, that was in presence with
the Gods: Yet they were in *Hades* also, that is in *another world*
after they were wiped out from hence. Hither they admitted on-
ly *Philosophers, Heroes, & such like*. Thus hither it is that *Pla-*
to assigneth *Socrates*, and thus *Socrates* him selfe hopeth to goe to
Hades, to the wise and good God. Other Soules of good men they
gave Blessednes vnto in the *Elysian* fieldes vnder the earth as they
fancied, or where els I know not. And these were also in *Hades*.
So that both these estates and condicions of blessed Soules de-
scended which was their Heaven (though differing very much in pla-
ces) they yeelded to be in *Hades*. Whence I thinke some of the
Fathers, and after them some Papistes, haue fayned diuers places
of rest and ioy to the Dead. Heaven presently to the Martyrs, but
to other good Christians an other place of rest & ioy (which they
called *Abrahams bosome*) either in the earth, or where they also
knew not. Howbeit into the glory of Heaven and the presence of
God and of Christ they admit none, save only the Martyrs before
the last day. But this error and all other errors about *Hades*, the
Apostles sufficiently confute in their writings: so that we are not
now to respect the same in the vse of *Hades*. Onely we are there-
fore to note how much and what (besides all errors) may be
truly retayned and meant by the Apostles in applying this word
Hades, as the Heathen did, to both sortes of Soules of Dead men.
They might truly vnderstand that both have *one common condi-*
cion and state as touching their being in another world, as they were
dissolued, departed from and wiped out of this visible world, & as
they were now in the world of the Dead an opposite estate & con-
dition to the living. This also the very Natural *Etymologie* of the
word according to Grammar, doeth properly yeeld in that it si-
gnifieth *Unseene*, or *Not seene any more in this world, or an estate*
not seene heere with our eyes asides, an Unseene place, as Plato cal-
leth it. Where note, it cannot be referred to the estate of *Angels*,
because *Hades* is the unseene state of them that *once had a visible*
and ordinary being and conversation heere in this world. So that
very deed it hath properly but a *Privative sense*, & not any thing
positive in it: though this you can not brooke. All this then the
Apostles might well vnderstand & allow in the word *Hades*, with-
out any taint of Heathenisme. And therefore also doubtles to

Hades. The
he may be
said of Shet.

pag. 194.

did. But the heathens further made *Hades* a Divine power (whom also they called *Pluto*, as it were the God of Death, or of the Dead) because (as before is shewed) they dreamed that he held all that were Dead, vnder his power, both blessed & damned soules. And because no man that dyeth whether good or bad, doeth ever live heere againe: and because all whosoever without exception must dy, therefore they call him *Hades amélichos kai adamastos*, implacable and vnmastersed: and *Néktes étor echón* having a mercesse heart. In which sense in Latin also they vsed *Parca*, Destiny: the ende of all, because it spareth none. Certainly this Deifying of such a Power or to make a God of it, the Apostles abhorred: and every where in their writings they shew what Idolatry and extream impiety it is. But yet they may and do acknowledg such a power of Death, which worketh this Destruction of all men frō the world, & detaypeth them in Death afterward. Wherefore they haue in sundry places *Prosopopœia* thereof as in the Revelation the *Keyes of Death and Hades*: *Death riding on a pale horse, and Hades following after him: Death and Hades yielded up their dead, and both were cast into hell.* Likewise that, *O Death where is thy sting, O Power of death where is thy victory.* But of these more anon. Hitherto the 1. observation is manifest that the Apostles vsing the Heathens words, yet need not, nor do not vnderstand in them any of their fancies and errors; which by their doctrine otherwise they refuse; nevertheless they may and do vnderstand the generall truth signified in them, whatsoever the Heathens vsed by them to signifie and imply. And thus is our worde in controversy *Hades* cleared! But to cleere the rest also of those which by you object: See we are to observe that the Apostles transfer the Heathens Civill words many times to their Ecclesiasticall use, namely keeping yet still the proportion of their former sense. As in these, *Apostle, Bishop, Deacon, Gospell, Law, Sinne, Repentance, hope, Conscience, Concupiscence, &c.* Which change is small and easy, sith the words have a iust proportion still together both in Civill and Ecclesiasticall vse. Onely if any difference or oddes be, it is expressly vttered in some part of the Apostles doctrine besides. There is no such cause, nor matter of difference to be found in *Hades*. Third. The Apostles do vse some wordes that *Excellen* by excellence, & yet in no point altering the native vse or property

b Pag. 10
2.

3.

See all the
before
med, or
all of them
may be con-
sidered also
for this
ale.

ag 403.

4.

om. 1. 17.
bac 2. 4.

erty of them. Thus *Scripture* is vsed commonly for the Will
of God only, *Diabolos* for the Diuell, although sometimes other
writings are called also *Scripture*, and other Accusers and slander-
ers *Diabolos*. But neither hath this consideration any place in
Hades, that in *Scripture* it should signifie chiefly Hell: much lesse
only, Which thing by you avouch. Lastly, Som think the Apostles
altered the worde *Faith* from the Passive sense of it importing
Faithfulness and *honestie*, as the Heathens commonly vsed it, to
the Active sense, which is *True* beliefe or *Trust* vsed in the
Scriptures: which you also object. But I suppose the Apostles
tooke this Active sense of the word *Faith* from the Old Testament,
meeteley translating the Hebrue into Greeke. For I see not what
difference at all there is betweene *Pistis*, and *Emmanab* whereby
the Iewes signified *Faith to salvation*. Which is reason enough
for this vse thereof in Greeke by the Apostles, namely, if it bee
Hebraisme, though it bee not very sureable to the Heathens vs
thereof. The like I iudge of *Elder*, *Law*, *Sinne*, &c. But *Hades* for
Hell hath no like reason. Further I think even the Heathens have
vsed this word *Faith*, sometime Actively as the Gospel usually
hath in likewise the Gospel abhorreth not altogether the Passive
vse of it for *Faithfulness*. Lastly, if it were so that the Apostles did
follow no other reason, but meeteley transferred that word from
the Civill passive to the Ecclesiasticall active vse, we say on neede
say they might do it. For having some Spirituall doctrine to de-
liver and the ordinary speech wanting some fit word for the same,
then they might, yea of necessity they were forced to take some
word needest in nature and sense to their purpose, & so they might
give to that word a peculiar Ecclesiasticall vse. Further then an-
early it had. But *Hades* for Hell hath no help by this reason: they
tooke the word *Gabenna* from the Hebreues, and vsed it proper-
ly for Hell. Therefore they need not alter *Hades* for that purpose
for which they had another proper word. It is manifest then that
the Apostles still kept the proportion of the sense in all their words
translated from the common and usuall speech of the Heathens
far as any reason of truth might be alike in both, & so they kept
indeed still the *soungs and language of the Nations*: and therefore
Hades with the Apostles can not be properly *Hell*, as even the
Heathens also properly it was never, on 11. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

I suppose yet you will say, The Fathers take *Hades* for Hell. I answered before how they sometime take it *determinately* and strictly; so they signifie Hell by it. Sometime they take it largely & generally according to the Ancient Heathens vse: and so they signifie by it nothing but the generall state of Death pertayning alike both to good and bad deceased, as I have declared. Thus you get nothing by them: albeit sometime they *restraine* the worde *Hades* more then they ought to restraine it.

Here also were place to have added somewhat for iustifying that I said, The Fathers do alter the ancient true vse of some words both Greeke and Latin, from whom (in controversies) we ought to appeale to their authentike vse in Scripture and Classicall authors. But because you send me about *Chironia* to another place, I am content to examine what you have there to the contrary. Which seeing it draweth me into further matter therevnto appertaining, I will differre for this time.

Hitherto we have tryed the nature and vse of *Hades*, and have found it to be not properly *Hell*, as you avouch. No, nor when it is applied to soules of men deceased. And therefore also that it can not be so vnderstood in Act. 2. 27. where it is applied to Christs Soule after he was dead. Which yet is the only place that you have to pretend. Now something more you bring for your purpose from the Circumstances of this Text: which we must consider. But first let vs simply and plainly vnderstand the same, according to our former true declaration of the nature and vse of *Hades*.

Where the text is, *I know wilt not leave my Soule in Hades*, or *Hades*: we may simply take *Hades* for the invisible state or place of the deceased. And so supplying the defect of a word which must be vnderstood, thus we may say *eu ton topon*, or *choron hadou*: in the place or region of the invisible state or world of the Deceased. Otherwise we may take it simply for *Death*, force & strength and power: supplying also the same words *eu ton topon*, or *eu choron hadou*, in that place where the power and strength of Death pervaileth and holdeth the deceased Soules from their Bodies. This is the World of the Dead, implying nothing else but an estate opposite our visible estate in this world. I have may be been taken, as I have largely proved before, how *Hades* & *Chironia* are in effect all one: and may both be applied even to iust

mens Soules deceased, but *hades* more easily & naturally. Let of
all we may take *hades* heere by a *Prosopopoeia* conceaving it to be
(as it were) som Person of vnresistable power taking away & with-
holding from hence al mens Soules departed. Howbeit this power
was controlled and loosed by God in Christes Resurrection. And
then we may construe it thus: *eu* ten chorā, topon, or oikian *Ha-*
don, in the place, region, or habitation of this mighty power. Or
eu to *Kratos*, exousian, dynamin, or epikratan tou *Hadon*, to the
strength, power, or dominion of this Destroyer of life. Thus how-
soever we take it, (though this last way is not the vnlikelyest) *Ha-*
des heere signifieth in effect nothing els but Death, & that Christes
Soul (departed this life) was held therein, but could not be holden
fast. You object, 'We must not make a Figurative sense but where
manifest need is. Heere is no need of a figurative sense. Therefore
heere ought to be no Figure supposed. I answer, First wee grant
your Conclusion: whether of the 2. former wayes soever that we
take *hades*, so there is simply no Figure at all therein. Sec: Then
your own sense of Hell in this place is cleane overbrowne by your
selfe. For whensoever *hades* and *sheol* do signifie Hell, it is indeed
by a Figure: namely *Synecdoche*, where the *Whole* is set for a part,
which I have proved at large before: & particularly by *Tren-*
hus a sufficient man for his Hebrue skill. Wherefore by this rea-
son Hell cannot possibly be meant heere, if no Figure be admit-
ted. Third: it seemeth convenient and also likely to take *hades*
heere by a *Prosopopoeia*, after our 3. sense before noted. Which
kind of Figure suppoeth (as it were) a Person of that thing which
otherwise a word properly signifieth. So that by this figure
nothing of the wordes native signification is diminished. Thus our
word *hades* is vied in the Corinthians, *O Hades* where is thy victo-
ry? Also as it may seeme in the 'Revelation Death & Hades were
cast into Hell. Thus then it is nothing but emphatically signifying
the power of Death. Fourth: Admit that *hades* and *sheol* did pro-
perly signifie Hell, as (we see) they do not. Likewise that some-
times they signifie only the Grave, which also you acknowledge
it is true, when it is applied to a dead Body. Again admit
that by a Figure they signifie the whole Person, yea the whole
Body sometimes. Then I affirme that heere in this place of *hades*
there ought to be understood a Figurative sense. Heere

mainly most necessary cause. For take them thus literally (as you doe) and they impugne the groundes of faith and charity. Which I you grant (& that rightly) is sufficient to cause a Figurative sense in Scripture. But how do they impugne *faith* or *charity*, being taken as you take them? Verily thus; Your sense implyeth by the way and consequently, that a good and sinles man (yea the best that ever was) worthy of Paradise and the highest Heavens, yet after death did go to Hell. And further, that being in Heaven, yet he stayed not there (as you say) but immediately came out againe to go into Hell. Again, that a Humane soule being in the depth of Hell, yet should feelee no paines: and that being locally in hell it should com out thence also. What can be more against the generall rules of the Scripture then these things? Yea how doth this impugne our generall charity towards all the iust when they dy? Besides many other disproportions and vnreasonable inconveniencies following withall, as anon we shall further see. Wherefore if by any meames possibly a Figure may be heere admitted, certainly it must be so: for these most necessary causes last rehearsed. The rather seeing no other text any where insinuateth any such peculiar matter in Christ, that he should differ in these points from all good men els, as you do vrge.

f Pag 16

Points in Assertion contrary to the common opinion of Faith and charity.

But you say, the circumstances heere doe prove that the word must be *Hell* properly taken. That I would faine see. What are these circumstances. First, this place sheweth a special prerogative vntoed in none but in Christ. I deny it: heere is no such prerogative mentioned. Except this, that whereas some other men after death have returned to life againe, it was not by their owne power, as Christs Resurrectio was. Again, God in his revealed wil having signified by his Prophet long before that he should be restored speedily to life againe: thus it was simply *impossible* that Christ should be holden fast by the power of Death, although it had got hold of him. And so indeed he had a prerogative before all men els, which also is heere shewed vs: but no other prerogative in the world neither heere, nor any where els can be gathered touching his returne from Hell. You adde, No sinner (dead) was ever freed from corruption but only Christs. What then? Ergo his Soule was in Hell? Or els, why bring you such needles and impertinent matter. Besides, I iudge that not to be true. Were not some be-
ing

The Circumstances against f Pag 17

f Pag 17

ing dead raised to life againe before their flesh putrified: But none (you say) in the sepulchre. And what then? How will this inferre or prove, that so none but Christs Soule was ever supported in Hel, or that it was ever there. These are simple reasons for so great a conclusion. Then you say, *If by Hell we understand Paradise it was no privilege to be there not forsaken, but rather a childish absurdity to thinke any Soule might be there forsaken.* It is a strange absurdity still to abuse your reader calling this word Hel, which indeed is nothing but Death in effect, the Power of death, or the condition and state of death. Againe to presume that wee take it for *Paradise* or *Heaven*, or *Hell* at any time; when we referre it all wayes to the *generall state of the Dead*, and no further immediately. Now in this Christ had cause to reioyce that neither his Soule nor Body was left: but so soone rayled vp to perfit life againe, and so fitted to a full receaving of glory, which within few dayes after he had. Also besides this cause (his deliverance from the condition of death) he had an other inestimable cause to reioyce that he was raised to life againe, namely that he might fulfill his whole work for our Salvation, which before his Resurrection, Ascension, &c. he could not accomplish. Further ^b you object, that Peter maketh mention that the sorrows of death were broken, that they should not hold Christ nor hinder him from rising againe. But there were none such in the Grave, none in Paradise. Therefore in Hel Christs Soule was, whence he was delivered when he rose againe, I denie ytterly this sequele. Because the text saith not that there were any present sorrowes in Hades where Christ was. Heere is not a word to any such purpose. What saith the text, "*God raised him up, loosing the sorrowes of Death, because it was impossible for him to be holden fast of it.*" Will you conclude fro hence: Ergo there were present sorrowes in that place where Christ was? There is no strength in this reason. The Apostle signifieth heere 2. or 3. things. 1. That God loosed Death fro him, wherein hee was held, but could not be holden fast. 2. That this Death had bene a most sorrowfull & painfull Death, which indeed he tasted to the full vpon the Crosse. As this Hebrewisme, *the sorrowes of Death* (for a *sorrowfull Death*) may emphatically signifie. Also he may set these 2. the *sorrowes of Death* thus together, as the Cause and the Effect: signifying that by the violence of sorrowes and bitter paines which he under

ed, Death came vnto him & tooke hold of him: but it could not hold him fast, because God himselfe loosed and dissolved it. Thus then it can not follow by the text, that there were sorrows now in *hades* where Christ was. Further the very text implyeth that Christ was holden in this which was loosed from him: I say, he was holden but not *holden fast*. Now he was not holden in sorrows, for then he could not but have felt them after death: which you will not affirme. It was therefore Death (which came by sorrows) whereof he was holden, but not held fast. Again it appeareth that Christ was in that which was loosed and rid from him: Thou wilt not leave my soule in *hades*. I say, he was now in the same wherein he was not left nor forsaken. But he was in no sorrows at all now, for then I think he should have felt them: he was in death and in the power thereof. Therefore it was Death and the power thereof, which was loosed at Christs resurrection: not any present sorrows and paines. Neither is it the nature of Sorrows to *hold and binder* fro Resurrection: but it is the strength of Death which doth that. Thus your collection out of Austin is against the true and plaine meaning of the text, where you say that the sorrows of death (or hel) were broke before Christ, & so he was never in the, but as the snarts of hunters are broken *no tendant in manu tenentur* before: they tooke hold, not after they had taken hold. This is merely imagined: the text plainly meaneth an other loosing and dissolving, namely of the power of Death (as I said) vnder the which Christs manhood (even the Body also, as well as the Soule) was now for a while held, but not victoriously holden fast; when Gods will was that he should rise againe. Yet you mightily vige how that it is Austin's collection from this text. I perceave your argument is from Austin, and not from Peter, as you pretend. When you cite Scripture it is enough belike, if any learned man do collect and frame an opinion from the text, whether right or wrong. You may easily see by what before, that this collection of Austin hath no ground nor reason in the text, but is indeed disproved by it. Which may the sooner be conceaved, if we note how he misse in his Translation of these words. Thus he readeth *solus deus in inferni, quia impossibile erat tenere eum in illis*: whom God raised up loosing the sorrows of hell, because it was impossible that he should be held in them. But the text hath, *Loosing the sorrows of death*, seeing it was impossible that he

a *Gravel*
to be
fast, o
tenly,
Gloria
holden

b *encate*
fai.

† By m
Sorrows
fick of
who m
them.

c Pag. 1

" You
the ve
pa, 17
ting d
it.

d Pag. 1
196.
e Pag. 1
170.

August.
99.
f Thami
not Had
which h
staketh
Hell.

et alii Thai:
is more
in Austins
to bee
ply hold
yp' autem:
in illis, in
sorrow,
hath it.

a. 29.

30

Thom. A.

ad Gal.

ad Rom.

ad Cor.

ad Eph.

ad Phil.

ad Col.

should be *holden fast* or strongly holden *as it*. Thus it seemeth Austin looked not to the original, which he ought to have done specially now inquiring into and lifting out an obscure point of Christian faith, as it appeareth that heere Austin doth. In no wise ought he to have leaned to a faulty Translation, as this is which he followeth. Seeing therefore hee fayled in expressing the text, no marvaile if his Collection fro it were wide. Wherein also he is no where resolut nor perswaded indeed: therefore a weak stay is he alone, for our faith to rest on in this article. Nay in the winding up of that Epistle his godly modesty is registred for example to you and all Christian Ministers. He gives vs good leave to refuse his collection and opinion heere, so that we bring better reason. Thus he saith, *Hec expositio verborum Petri cui displicet, &c.* Now whether we bring reason to dissent from *Austin* heerein or no, I referre it (not to you to iudge, who are to partiall, but) to every indifferent learned reader. The rather for that no Circumstances of this text doe make also affirmatively for vs. First, *Peter* plainly granteth all this matter of *David* as well as of *Christ*: except this, that *David* was left therein even *ill this day*, as *Christ* was not. But *David* was never in *Hell*. Therefore neither *Christ* was ever there, whose figure *David* was. See: If it be altogether heere from the purpose of *Peter* to speake to the ignorant and vnbeleeving Iewes of *Christs* Soules being in hell, then there is no reason to take these wordes *hades* and *sheol* heere for hell. But by the whole *Text* it is evident, *Peter* had no reason nor purpose to speake to the Iewes of *Christs* Soules being in hell. Therefore I see not how *hades* & *sheol* (if they but might signifie otherwise) can heere signifie hell. His whole and direct purpose was to shew them of *Christs* Soules departure out of this world, and of his Body lying dead in the grave, as is the maner of other men when they dy, and that he was from thence mightily *raysed* up againe to life, more then other men were, or can be. Heere to speake to them of his Soules being in hell, what were there in it: 1. They being (as I said) ignorant, vnbeleeving, and stubborne. 2. The thing being invisible strange and vncouth, not subiect to sense, and without all example of the like in the whole Law, & namely no Figure foreshadowing any such matter to be fulfilled in him. 3. He intending only in all this speech to shew them that this Iesus whom they had slaine was not now dead but risen againe, why should he speake heere of hell.

Christ

Christes being there made nothing the more to shew his Resurrection, which was the only scope of his speech. But being so disproportioned with their former faith and vnderstanding, it would rather hinder then further them to the Christian faith. Both these Circumstances I noted before, but I see no answer to them. Wherefore I hope, they with the rest of my assertions heerein are firme and good.

Thus it appeareth that *hades* doth not every where signifie Hell in the New Testament. We have seene that it hath no such meaning in the *Altar*, which yet is the only Scripture whereon you build. Alas, how litle a shew serueth your turne, when affection leadeth you. This were sufficient to end this Argument: but yet it shalbe good also to try whether any where els *Hades* properly signifieth Hell. Verily it doth so signifie no where at all in the Scripture. Yet I graunt it is & ought to be translated *Hell* in 2. places. Not that the word it self doth necessarily signifie *Hell*, but because the circumstances heere doe require that meaning, as the fittest & best for these particular purposes. In the 1. Christ promisetht that *Gates of Hades shall not preuaile against his Church*. He meaneth no destruction nor desolation shall root it out, nor take it away from the world vnterly. Now seeing of the Churches Destroyers Hell is the chiefest, and the malice and rage of Satan is the most violent aduersarie: that the Church (being assured against the worst enimie) may be confirmed and comforted against all other whatsoeuer, therefore *kat' exochen* *Hades* heere signifieth Hell, & for speciall emphasis we are to name it Hell. Which particular is heere intended thus indeed, being alwayes cōtayned otherwise in the compasse of this general word *Hades*. So that albeit the *gates of Hades* in their own simple nature & common vse are the same as the *gates of Sheol* or *maroth*, (which are no more but the *gates of Death*) as before I haue shewed, and as others call it, *perihesis mariondi*, a phrase or speech signifying Death: yet I say the circumstances heere in *Matthew* doe require a greater emphasis in it. Even that Hell should be chiefly and particularly noted as to wake against Gods Church; that so we should much lesse feare al other evils. Likewise in *Luke*, I grant *Hades* is to be translated Hell: yet onely because of the circumstances there. Seeing the wicked miser being nowc in the *state of Death*, was in torment; which

ver. 18

a Pa. 176
403.

b Mat. 16
Luc. 16

c Pag. 1
Zuign
Ely. 3
Moller
Psal. 16

† Luk. 1

now where could this be indeed but in Hell? So that heere also for better emphasis sake it is best to name it Hell; but not for the nature of the word *Hades*. With the worthy M. Bucer noteth wel, saying, *Dives non simpliciter scribitur esse in Hade, sed & in Gehenna: quia in tormentis & flammis.* The Rich man is not saide to bee simply in *Hades*; but also in Hell: because he is saide to be in fiery torments. Thus I grant in 2. places Hell is intended by *Hades* in the Scripture. But what then? Will you conclude from this, as you do about *Abyssus*? In the Revelation, and Luke^d *Abyssus* is vsed to signifie Hell. Therefore it signifieth hell in the *Romans: or therefore every where properly it signifieth hel. "Death sometime is the 2. Death. Ergo it is so, Act. 2. 24. If you will argue so about *hades* also from those 2. places before named, I can easily deny your argument in all. The vnturth whereof hath appeared before in that principall place of the Acts: and likewise shall appeare in all the rest following by Gods helpe. Next let vs ^a consider, ^b And thou Capernaum, which art lift up to the Heaven, shalt be brought down to *Hades*, to Destruction. I say *Hades* heere is not hell, but the Destruction of Capernaum the City. Christ threatneth 1. this proud and lofty City in selfe: also the inhabitants thereof for despising his Gospell. The City it selfe with destruction and razing out from the face of the earth, which is it that hee meaneth by *Hades*. The inhabitants the wicked people thereof he threatneth with ^c Damnation in hell. For the 1st. I vnderstand that so *Hades* sometime may be referred to the Destruction even of vncertaine things, as well as of reasonable men. For it seemeth the generation of the word *Hades* is such that it signifieth *No visible being heere any more, or Destruction from this world* (as the proper Erymologie thereof admitteth) to any visible Creature perishing fro hence. Though it be certaine, it is not so often applyed to other things: but it belongeth most commonly & usually indeed to Men only. Notwithstanding to other things we may find it applyed as when *Plato* (which^e you stumble at) saith in *Hades* were *Birds, Beasts, Trees, Flowers, Fruits, &c.* I deny not but they had fabulous and toyish conceits about these things being in *Hades*: but wise men may see how their meaning was, these visible creatures being once brought to Destruction & to have no being any more heere, that then they yeilded *hades* vnto them also, like as they did vnto the departed hence. This may be the meaning also of *Plus*. where^e he

2. 11. 2.

m. 10. 7.

2. 170.

2. 11. 2.

2. 11. 2.

2. 11. 2.

2. 11. 2.

in the
gene.

2. 11. 2.

arch. de
v. 11.

maketh *Hades* to have the whole contrary part to the *Sunne* (whom they called *Helios*, *Apollo*, & *Deiws*, and *Pythius*) because all Creatures vnder the *Sunne* (as we vse to speak) when they perish hence and have no more being in this world, com to *Hades*. And thus it seemeth Moses also vserh *Sheol*, when he saith, ^b men, women, children, and cattell alsw, yea houses and riches went to *Sheol*. Therefore heere Moses certainly meaneth not Hell, as "you think: but he signifieth 2. things. 1. That all these things were taken vtterly away out of this world by an unrecoverable *Destruction*: which is the most generall and large sense of *Sheol*. 2. That they descended downe into a ^b valt and deepe Gulfe in the earth: which also *Sheol* doth very often signifie in the Scripture, like to *Abyssus* in Greek. After which maner also those ^c *Sheepe in Sheol* (which ^d you turne to the worst) may be vnderstood. Thus I say *Sheol* may shew the vtter taking away (not of men onely, but) of other things also when they have no being in this world any more. Which Abacuk also meaneth in saying, ^e neither *Sheol* nor *Death* can be satisfied; if he make any difference in these. Also in the very like place of the ^f *Proverbs*, *Sheol* seemeth to bee most rightly vnderstood in the most large signification. To which sense likewise, I take it that phrase in *Daniel*, *en lo*, may be compared, though heere it be vsed of *Messiah*: *ikkare Messiah*, *ve en lo*, *Messiah* shall be cut of and shall have *No being*. He meaneth, Not any more as he was before in this world: which in effect is nothing els then that which *Sheol* signifieth. Yet wee must come neerer. You alleage 2. frivolous proofes of *Sheols* signifying Hell: viz: when it hath *8 Opposition* to *Heaven*, and *Situation as the lowest*. For the *Situation* of Hell, it is a secret which Gods worde hath not revealed at all. Neither ought we to determine, as you very rashly do, ^h *if Hel be any where*, there can be no doubt but it must be in the lower parts of the earth. You know the Apostle mentioneth the ⁱ *Ayre*, and that ^k *on high*, as being the place of *Diuels*. Norwithstanding far be it from me to affirme that hell certainly is not beneath. Yet your pretended scriptures are meerely forced to proue it. As in the chief I have shew already. In the rest it will appeare likewise anon. Howbeit, wheresoever *Hel* indeed is, though we do grant in it to be locally in the earth beneath vs; yet every *Opposition* betwene *Shammajim* the *Heavens* or *Skies*, and *Sheol* doth not signifie the opposition

^b Numb. 31.
30. 33.

^c Pag. 130.

^b As also Ps.
86. 13. and
88. 7.
^d Dent. 32.
^e Psal. 49.
^d Pag. 139.

^e Abac. 2. 2.

^f Pro. 30. 16.

^g Dan. 9. 26.

^g Pag. 147.

^h Pag. 112.

ⁱ Ephe. 2. 2.
^k cap. 6. 12.

betweene Heaven and Hel. This you shall never be able to prove *Shammajim* thus placed signifieth the Skyes, not the place of Heavenly glory in the presence of God, which in English we call Heaven. And *Sheol* thus placed signifieth not Hell, the place of torments: but it is taken thus 2. wayes. Sometime for ^a a vast and deepe Gulfe only or pit in the earth, the bottom wherof we know not. So doe ^a many of your places meane, which you draw and wrest to signifie Hell. Sometime for Ruine and Destruction or Abolishing of any visible Creatures from hence: which seemeth to be the largest & most proper sense of *Sheol*. So doth it in *Isay* signifie, where *Sheol* is threatned to the King of Babel, ^b *Though thou be lifted up to the Skyes, yet shalt thou bee brought downe to Sheol*, that is (in this place) to an inglorious Destruction and No being in this word: and (thy carcase) *unto the sides of the pit*, that is the Grave. This the contrariety heere sheweth, *Though thou be lifted up to the Skyes*. He meaneth not heere, into the glory of the Saints of God in Heaven: but lifted vp in great pomp and worldly glory, as the Latin phrase meaneth also when they say *ad sydera tolli*. Now saith the Prophet to this King of Babel: *Though at this time it be thus with thee, yet surely thou shalt be brought down to the contrary point, to an inglorious Destruction, and wiping out from the Earth*. Which sense of *Isay* is also very well confirmed by the like matter in *Jeremy*. ^c *Though Babel should mount up to the Heavens, and though she should defend her strength on high: yet from me shall her Destroyers come, saith the Lord. A sound of a cry cometh from Babel, and of great Destruction from the Chaldeans, &c.* Where that which *Isay* called *Sheol*, *Jeremy* speaking of the very same matter nameth *Destruction, utter laying wast, and overthrowing* of that City and State. And so to come to our purpose, ^d this is the very same phrase heere in *Matthe* touching Capernaum: *Thou Capernaum which art lift up to the Heaven shalt be brought down to Hades*: that is, to Destruction, to an inglorious Not being any more in the world as before time it had ben. Which also is confirmed by that which he addeth presently of Sodom, that if they had had the meanes of repentance as Capernaum had, *Sodom might have remayned a City to this day*. Inferring by this that Capernaum for their greater contempt of God and his word, deserved more then Sodom to be destroyed.

Abyssus.

Amos 9. 2.

Job. 11. 8.

Psa. 139. 8.

Heels proper sense.

Isa. 14. 15.

Jer. 51. 53.

A very Hebraisme.

Hades Destruction, Razing, taking away.

to becom no City. Hitherto this is the first iudgment threatned to the state of the City; *Hades* Destruction, or an vtter razing out from the earth. The 2. iudgment heere threatned followeth in the next verse, *Moreover I say vnto you that it shalbe easier for them of the land of Sodom in the day of iudgment then for these.* Heere indeed is *Hell* threatned to them of Capernaum: yet as touching that before, there was nothing els but *the overthrow and destruction of their Citie* signified by that worde *Hades*, applyed to the Citie, as is before declared. And contrary to this you haue not any piece of reason in al that "you say here about. The world of Soules (which t^y you play withall) *Hades* may and doeth signifie: but yet then only when it is referred to deceaied Soules, & not otherwise. Next, let vs view the *Corinthes* ^a *O Death where is thy victorie? O Hades, O Destruction, or, O Power of Death where is thy sting?* Heere it is referred to the destruction of the whole and intire Persons of men taken away by death out of this worlde: who in the end by this conquest and triumph over Death & the power thereof (at the last day) shalbe restored to life againe in a true and perfect Resurrection and restitution. This is the whole scope and drift of the Apostle heere: and you graunt it. But you inferre, that therefore it is meant of Hel. Of Hell, which way? Because since by sinne Hell gat possession of both parties of man as well of his body as of his Soule, the full deliverance and conquest ouer Hell, is not but in the Resurrection. This is very vntrue. Our full deliverance from Hell and from Satan is obtayned in this life: as it is written, ^b *We being delivered from our enemies and from the handes of all that hate vs, must serue him without feare all the dayes of our life in holines and righteousness before him.* That is, we being heere truly iustified by his grace, are fully freed and delivered from all the power of our enemies. Satan is ^c conquered, spoyled, bound, and cast out from vi. So that your speach is very bad and scandalous, where you say, *The bodies of the Saintes lying in their graves are in the Druggs Walke.* For then the Graves where bodies ly senseles, are a part of Hell, properly taken. At least the Deaths of the Reprobat and of the Children of God, (^e touching the state of their bodies) till the resurrection, are all one: And men truly iustified are iustified but in their Soules, Sinne remayning stil charged on their Bodies, and therefore in their bodies they remaine subiect to the power of

"Pa. 147. 14

409.

† Pag. 401.

409.

a Pag. 408.

1. Cor. 13. 13

b Luke 1. 7

c Luke 11. 8

Rom. 8. 33

Ioh. 8. 51

& 5. 24

d Pag. 216.

e Answer

to your

time

pag. 216.

You call it
a part of the
wages of sin.

Page. 156.

Not subie-
ct to the
range of Sa-
tan.

Page. 116.

Page. 178

Page. 179.

Cor. 15. 26.

It is because
it is painfull
to the flesh in
this life.

Page. 408.

As it utterly
taketh away,
& withholdeth
from a visible
state.

of Hell, and to the curse of the Law, and to the claime of Satan, till the day of our Resurrection at the last iudgement. And thus the godly must pay "a part of their own redemption and satisfaction for sinne. And then Christ was not our only and absolute Redeemor. If this be good doctrine, let the godly iudge. Your selfe overthroweth this enogh, saying, *He changed the curse of death and made it now a rest from all labours.* So that I hope the Bodies of the dead Saintes are not in the *Divells walke*: much lesse are they *in the possession of Hell, in the handfast of Hell.* Further you say vpon the text: *Through death Christ destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Divell.* Whereby *it is evident, that Hell is spoyled of all right and claime to the members of Christ, be brake, &c.* I hope in this life the godly are the members of Christ: then in this life they are *fully freed from Hell for euer.* Wherefore it is very vnrue that Hell properly taken, hath any possession of the iust, and handfast or power on them, or that Hell is not fully subdued for them vntill the Resurrection. I graunt that the common death heere is called an *enemy*: but he meaneth not such an Enemy as Hell is, especially as this is spoken touchinge the godly. Yet it is an Enemy even to them, not as any Curse at all, but as a Memoriall & consequent of the old Curse (like as a scarre is where was a deadly wound) also as a peaceable and quiet stopp or stay vnto them, that their whole persons cannot yet enioy their appointed felicitie. Howbeit for all this toward them it hath not the least affinitie with Hell at all. Therefore *Hades* heere in no sort signifyeth Hell, but only Death, or the power of Death, or the world and kingdom of Death, or something to that effect onely. Yea the very text seemeth thus to expound it selfe, saying, *When is thy sting, O Hades? The sting of Death is sinne.* Where the latter seemeth a very direct answer and exposition of the former words. Thus, *The sting of Death (or Hades) is sinne*: noting these wordes (Hades and Death) as *Synonimae* for one thing, being applyed to men. Or if "you will haue them to differ, He may take *Hades* for the "Power & strength of Death (which the brain-sick Idolators made a God) or the Dominion and Kingdome of Death. These respectes *Hades* might well haue with the Apostle, which differ from *Thanatos Death*, the meere separation of the Soule from the Body: which yet in effect are all one, and have no difference.

difference touching our purpose. Like as we saw ^a before howe all
 Authours have vied them. Further, The Grave of the Wicked is
 not to be named nor reckoned Hell properly, nor any part there-
 of. In Hell there wanteth not sense of paine. If you say, it is an en-
 trance to hell, and that which holdeth and reserveth the wicked
 vnto hell. Yet then it is not Hell: for even thus the Grave and
 Hell doe greatly differ. Finally, Hades is ^b aduersarie to the Resur-
 rection. But Hell would not bee aduersarie to the Resurrection.
 Therefore *Hades* heere is not hell, no not to the wicked. Death in
 deed and the Dominion of Death is an aduersarie to the Resurre-
 ction, and at that day it shalbe vanquished and vtterly abolished,
 when all flesh shall liue againe. As for Hell that shall increase the
 and bee advanced, when all the wicked both bodies and Soules
 shalbe subdued vnder it for ever. Therefore *Hades* heere is not hell,
 but the power of Death, as hath bene saide, or the Dominion of
 Death or meere to that effect. Also we are to note, that the Apo-
 stle heere plainly alludeth to that of Hoseah: *O Sheol, o kingdom*
of death, or power of Death, I wil be thy destruction. Not, *o Hell.*
 For the Prophet speaketh this to comfort Israel in their captivitie
 against their continuall Destructions and razings out from this
 world, shewing that now the Lord would stay his iudgement that
 way, & Death (which had consumed them) should now destroy
 them no more, but they should liue and flourish againe. This the
 Apostle might notably allude vnto, speaking of the Resurrectiō.
 As for Hell if the Prophet had meant it (as he doeth not) the A-
 postle could make no allusion to it, nor haue any thing to deale
 with it in this matter of the Resurrectiō simply. So that where you
 say, *what reason is there to exclude out of these words Christs victo-*
rie over Hell, it is very weake. What reason is there to include it,
 where the Apostle speaketh only of our resurrection from bodily
 Death, and of nothing els. Next we come to the Revelatiō: First,
I haue the Keyes of Hades (that is of Destruction, or of the ^a king-
 dome of death) *and of Death.* Or, we may take them as 2. words
 for one and the same thing: that is, both of them for *Death*. For
 heere Christ sheweth only, that as He was dead, so now he hath
 overcome Death, & hath power to dy no more: as I haue ^b heere-
 tofore noted. What shew of reason haue ^c you then, to bringe in
 heere Chrites power over the Damned Soules in Hell? Because

^a Pa. 162
 &c. 130

^b See be
 pag. 16

^c Hoſe.

^a Rev.

^b The
 ble w
 the D

^b Tre
 pa. 11
 c Pa. 1

there is mention elſwhere of the *Key of hell*: Therefore the *Key of hades* heer is the ſame. What color of reaſon is there in this? Again
 Rev. 6. 8. *a One ſitteth on a pale horſe whoſe name was Death, & Hades De-
 ſtruction, the world of the Dead, or the Kingdom of Death follow-
 ed after him.* This in no wiſe can be Hell: becauſe the text addeth,
*Power was given them to ſlay with the ſword and with famine, and
 death, and with wilde beaſts.* Hell ſlayeth none in that ſorte, theſe
 are not the weapons of Hell: but of the Dominion and Power of
 pag 406. Death theſe and ſuch other mo, are the proper weapons. *b* You
 take it to be the power of the Divell, becauſe the Divell ſlayeth
 ſometimes *the bodyes of men*. Which you proue by the bodily ſlay-
 ing and ſmiting of Iob and his children. This indeed is the thing
 which we holde. This is not the Torments of Hell in the place of
 Damned: theſe be onely bodily harmes and death. So that heere-
 by you confirme our purpoſe: for we denie not but God ſometime
 uſeth Satan to puniſh and to ſlay the bodies of men. But ſeeing
 this is nothing but *Death*, not *Hell* which then is inflicted: there-
 fore it is beſt to take Hades heere moſt generally as the nature of
 it is, for the *Power of Death, or the world of the Dead*. Hell by
 g. 398. no meanes it can be. You tell me in *c* one place, that my beſt ſkill
 is in varying phraſes. It is better to vary phraſes then to vary opi-
 nions, as you very often doe. I vary phraſes to expreſſe Hades,
 which in Authours is not alwayes the ſame thing: or at leaſt not
 after the ſame maner. Whoſe generall largenes which it properly
 hath, can not in one word be expreſſed in Engliſh. Wherefore my
 varying of phraſes to this purpoſe (I hope) is pardonable, ſith in-
 deed it is neceſſarie. That cōiecture of mine of the 4th part of the
 worldes not going to Hell at once, I never eſteemed it worth the
 ſtanding on. The laſt place is, *d Death and Hades* (that is the Do-
 miniō, or power of Death) *were caſt into Hell*. I ſaid, it was *abſurd*
 to ſay *Hell was caſt into Hell*: You answer, it is more abſurd to ſay
 the world of Soules was caſt into Hell. Where you doe but dally
 and play with words. For I uſe not that terme **the world of ſoules*,
 though it may be named ſometime, in a good ſenſe. Which you
 will by no meanes conceave: only you delight much to ſport your
 ſelfe with it. Our answer thē is this; There is no abſurditie to ſay,
 that at the laſt (day when the **laſt enemy ſhalbe deſtroyed*) then
 Death, and the power of Death, or the Kingdome and Dominion
 of

Rev. 6. 8.

pag 406.

g. 398.

ev. 30. 14

* the world
 of the Dead
 generally.

fore pag.

2.

of Death shalbe cast into Hel: that is eternally destroyed & abolished, & shall return to the Divell whēce they came. To say in any sort that the *Hell shalbe cast into Hell*, soundeth senseles in my eares. Although you meane the *Contayning* to be put for the *Contayned*, Hell for the Divels of Hel: and that the Divels shalbe the cast into hel fire. Yea although one *Andreas & Beda* vnderstand it so likewise. For neither you nor they (it seemeth) do consider, that this place assigneth them to Hell then at the last day, who yet are not in Hell, but shalbe then cast into Hell and destroyed. But the Divels are *in Hell* already, & reserved in everlasting chaines of darkness. Therefore the Divels cannot be vnderstood heere by Hades, that they shalbe then cast into Hel, seeing they are already cast in to Hell for ever. Death, and the Power thereof being the last enemy that shalbe destroyed, is not yet, but shalbe indeed at the last day abolished & swallowed vp of Hell. Lastly heere is shewed the most general & vniversall rendring vp of all the Dead whatsoever to iudgment. But Hel plainly hath not all the Dead: Death, & the world of the Dead, or the Dominion of Death have all. Therefore Death & Hades heere do not signifie properly the Divell & Hell: but this only, that Death, and the vniversall Dominion or power of Death yeelded vp to iudgment al the Dead, both great & smal both good and bad to be iudged according to their workes.

Thus it is evident and cleere that Hades no where in the New Testament doth signifie properly Hel, as you say it doth. Thus also that is concluded fully and perfectly which my 2. Reason before affirmed: that you have not one place at all in the Scripture to prove that Christs Soule was in Hell. ^b One place only you have stood vpon, that Christs Soule was in *Hades*: but that helpeth you nothing at all, as we have seene. You must prove indeed that Christs Soule was in *Gehenna*, if you would perswade any man of knowledg, which you shal never do. *Gehenna* in the New Testament is properly Hell: but Hades is never properly so taken, as I hope it is sufficiently before proved. Therefore the Conclusion is good, *To thinke that Christes Soule was ever in Hell, is a thing that ought to be utterly denied.*

Yet, heere we must consider a maine obiection of yours: even those words of our common Creed, which vsually in English we utter thus; *He descended into Hell*: originally *He descended*

a 2. Pet. 2.
Iud. 6.

† Pag. 19

b Act. 2. 27

Touching
Common

into *Hades*. And in truth this is all that you have to allege for your opinion. But I answer 2. wayes. First, Admitting, then Denying the authority of these words in our Comon Creed. 1. Admitting the authority of these words, (& yet, Not as sufficient, nor as Apostolicall, but such, as may be frō godly and sound Christians) we affirme that we can well vnderstand them according to the Scriptures vse of *Hades* rightly: viz: that Christes whole humane Person *came vnder the power and Dominion of Death*, or that he *decaying* in this world & * *falling down* from that state of life wherein a while he flourished, went absolutely from hence into the world of the Dead, according to the law of nature which all other men follow likewise when they dy. How this sense doth fully agree also with the mindes of the ancient Fathers generally, we have at large declared ^e before. But this serveth not your turne: & therefore you will needes inioyne vs ^d 3. Rules to be exactly and precisely kept in the expounding of these words: namely 1. *Distinction of matter*. 2. *Consequence of order*. 3. *Propriety of words*. You must know that we can be no more strict, nor more religious in observing the Circūstances of matter & order even in the holy Scriptures themselves, then you inioyne heere to be observed in these words of men. Might not these godly men (think you) misse in som such Circūstance or light point, although the Scripture can not? Or if they might, why impose you such strictnes on our consciences about mens words, as if heere were no possibility of any the least missing, or imperfection. Howbeit we admit your 3. Rules also, and will observe them sufficiently. First these words *He descended to Hades* may very well expresse a *Distinction of matter* differing from all the words heere besides. They naturally and properly signifie (as before we shewed) that Christ came to vtter decay in this world, and being taken hence was gathered in both partes (of his Manhood dissolved) wholly & intirely to those who were departed before him into another world. Or ells thus, that he came vnder the full power & ^e Dominion of Death. Now either of these differeth verily from meere and simple Death. For to Dy properly is nothing els but the going a sunder of the Soule from the Body. That other is to be wholly razed out from the presence and sight of this world, also a remayning vnder the possession and strength of Death, and a going to the society of them in another world. These indeed are ^f differing points and degrees

swere.

I.

e before
158.g. 166.
g. 154.

Note.

3. Rules.

I.

vian.
stimuance
death.e before
192.

in Death: albeit in effect generally they bee all one with Death, that is they be necessarily consequent, & alwayes conioyned vnto Death. Againe if those wordes in the Creed were only but a more emphaticall phrase of through and perfit Dying and Departing hence, if there were in them no further Distinctiō of matter then so, yet this were enough to distinguish them frō the other words, Dead and Buried. This is cause enough (especially in the Ancient times, when men suppose this Creed was framed, & when Christs Humanity and naturall Death was by al meanes subtilly and violently oppugned) after a short worde signifying his Death and Buriall, yet for more emphasis sake, and for further Vrging the same, to adde this other short familiar phrase importing (no other maine matter then was before noted, but only) a more effectuall and more absolut signification thereof. Which in trueth these our wordes in question doe well performe, *He came vnder the Dominion of Death*, or *Went to the societie of the Dead*, following presently after these wordes *Dead & Buried*. And thus your 2. Rule also, *Consequence of order* is rightly kept. For euen in respect of time it is certaine, that Christs whole person perishing frō hence was wholly ioyned to the Dead, after the precise separation of his Soule and body, which was his Death. And his Buriall being the visible part thereof, in good reason may be set before that which signifieth the whole contayning also his Soules invisible going vnto the Dead. Lastly, if there be no more in this but a stronger emphasis meerely, & a more full-signifying phrase, it might well come after termes of lesse emphasis. Your 3. and last Rule, *Proprietie of wordes* is plainly for vs, and against your selfe. For that which we strive for, is the ^anative and proper sense of Hades, even according to the etymologie of it, and according to common vse. You, if you vrge it to signifie Hel, do indeed make a [†]Figure in it, viz. *Synecdoche*, a part for the whole, as before we haue shewed. As for the other word heere in the Creed *katēbe* or *katēlthe*, *Hee descended*, or *came vnder*, it is not necessarie to take it alwayes to signifie a locall going downe, specially thus ioyned with Hades. For thus it may aptly & lively shew *the fall* or whole *casting down* of a mans person from the state of life, to death and vtter destruction out of this world: as also men are said *to stand up* and *spring up* when they live. Or it may serue to expresse *the Force and Do-*

2.

3.

a Pa. 197
169. 17

† Pa. 171

Katēbe, katēlthe, W
signifye

minion of Death which Christ came vnder when he dyed. Or the *abasement and humiliation* of Christ yeelding & submitting him selfe so farre, that is not onely to Dy, but also to come vnder the strength and force of death by lying held, & subdued (as it were) for so long time in it. All this the very property of the word *katebe* admitteth very easilie: and *Ruffinus* liketh it where he interpreteth this phrase "*Descendit in mortem*, He descended vnto Death. If any thinke this to be somewhat figurative, yet it is verily so familiar and easie to all people as that other word in this Creed is, *He sitteth at the right hand of God*: yea it is farie easier indeed. And heerein all the later famous, learned and godly Restorers of Religion in a maner doe ioyne with vs, as Mai. *Bucer*, P. *Martyr*, *Bulinger*, *Olevia*, &c. Yea M. *Calvin* "liked this also wel enough: though yet he seemeth to leane more to another sence (viz. *Christes Hellish sufferings*) which indeed is a true doctrine, as before is declared, though to this place of the Creed (I thinke) not so fit. Now these men your L. ought not to skorne nor reproch, though you have leave to deale so with me. Their pietie, learning, and authoritie is such with all that love the Gospell, as will overwaigh your big wordes and high lookes, and whatsoever els you are lifted vp withal aboue our mediocritie. Hitherto we haue answered, admitting the authoritie of these wordes *He descended to Hada*.

But wee are in truth to know, that (as you cite them and vige them) they have no such authoritie & credit, as hitherto we have yeelded vnto them. And that for 3. causes. First, for that your Translating and terming them, He descended into *Hel*, is corrupt, partiall, and vntue. Which I trust is manifest by that which I have shewed before touching the true property & natural vse of Hades. If you say among vs all men do so speak heere and translate *hades* *Hel*. I pray you consider that this article (as also I think this whole Creed) was at first written in Greek, and not in English. Wherefore the English terme (how comon so ever) must not preiudice vs, nor the truth in this matter, as very vnreasonably * you indevour to make it to do. Convince vs evidently and soundly by Greek authoritie, that Hades is alwayes Hell, or that Hades is never applyed to the condicion and state of the godly deceased, and then I will yeeld: or els my sufficient proofes before to the contrary will convince the vntue and partiall translation. Another

reason to deny vterly the authority and credit of these wordes
(*He descended to hades*,) & so to hold them vnable to make any
argument as from our Creed, is because this speciall clause of
Christs *descending to Hades* or to *Infernum* is new, and lately put
into our vulgar Creed called *the Apostles Creed*. ^b *Ruffinus* wit-
nesseth (who lived about 500. yeeres after Christ) that it was not
at all in the Creed in his time. I say not at all: neither in the Ro-
mane Creed, nor yet in the Creed of the Easterne Churches. His
words are these, *Sciendum sanè est quod in Ecclesia Romana sym-
bolo non habetur additum, Descendit ad inferna: sed nec in Orien-
tis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo*. Will you say, *Ruffinus* lyeth? Or can
you bring to the contrarie any prooffe? I think not: yea I am sure
you can not. Then if there were no such Article as this, nor anie
such wordes any where in the Creed for the space of 500. yeeres af-
ter Christ, I mervaile what authoritie they haue now to be taken
necessarily for a distinct article in our Creed, and as differing ma-
terially from *Dead* and *Buried*. Sure, it is ^a to new to be receaved
for doctrine, which ^b sprang vp so late. Yea, thus ^c *Erasmus* may
seeme to haue some colour for his coniecture, that about *Thomas*
Aquinas time they might (peradventure) be put into this Creed.
Third: we can not see, but that whensoever whosoever put it
first into this place, they signified heereby it seemeth, that *Christ*
went to Limbus, a place vnder the earth, where they imagined the
blessed Patriarkes rested. For this was indeed the opinion gene-
rally of the ancient Christians even for ^a a long time, and stil is re-
tayned among the Papistes, though now growen much worse the
it was of old. But this you iustly cõdemne as an error as wel as we,
how generall and how ancient soever it be. Now also though this
were the ¹st meaning of this Article, whensoever it firste tooke
place in the common Creed, yet this was not *Hell*: this giveth no
furtherance to your assertion, that Christ went into the place of
the Damned in tormentes. But *Thaddæus*, *Ignatius*, *Athanasius*,
haue these very words. Yet they say not any where that they were
in that set forme of the *Apostles Creed* which we now have. Also
they are cleane against your opinion heere, as presently wee shall
see. You will say, yet even *Ruffinus* in his exposition of the Creed
alleageth this article, and he alloweth the doctrine thereof. I an-
swere, He alleageth truly these wordes *Descendit ad inferna*, but
not

^b *Ruffin.*
Symb.

^a Namely
Descendit
Hades.
^b Pag. 13
^c *Erasm.*
Symb. Ca.
4.

^a *Limbus*
intertay
before C
descendit
hades w
our set le
of the C

^a Which
deed they
had not

not out of any example of the Apostles Creed: yea he expressly denieth it to be therein any where at that time, as before we shewed. Only it being his owne and the common opinion then, hee groundeth it vpon other reasons (namely certaine mistaken scriptures) yet such as he was content to like of, and so holdeth indeed that Christ went downe to *Infernum*, that is to *Limbus Patrum*, as an opinion then common among men, and worthy (as he thought) to be beleueed, and to be applyed to this place of the Creed touching the Death of Christ, although as yet no such matter was contayned in the common Creed. *Erasmus* sayeth, The Fathers would not be so rash as to put it into the articles of their Creed, seeing their opinions heereabout were so varying and doubtfull. Now this you know was all mistaken, wrongfully gathered from the Scriptures, as badly applyed to the Creed, & nothing els indeed but the common error of those tymes. Yet then hitherto all this is farre from iustifying your opinion, neither may you alleage the Creed for your warrant. Where note also that *Ruffinus* heere vnderstandeth the very matter it self (precisely signified by these words *Descendit ad inferna*) to be immediatly but this, that *He dyed like other good men, and was buried*. For hee saith, *Vis verbi eadem videtur esse in eo quod Sepultus dicitur: The effect of this phrase He descended to Infernum, seemeth to be all one and the same with this, He was Buried*. And afterwarde going about to prove by the Scripture that Christ descended to *Infernum*, he sheweth that hee meaneth his death heereby and his buriall: *Quod in infernum descendit euidenter prænuntiatur in Psalmis, ubi dicit: Et in pulverem mortis deduxisti me. Et iterum, Quae uulnera in sanguine meo dum descendo in Corruptionem*. And before vpon those wordes: *He was Crucified vnder Pon. Pilate, and descended to infernum* he giveth this sense among other wordes, *Divina natura in mortem per carnem descendit*. The Divine nature humbled it selfe eue vnto Death in respect of the flesh. Howsoever then he thinketh consequently that Christ descending to *infernum* did after Death goe to a place beneath vnto the godly Soules departed before, & then let them free from thence and caried them with him, yet it appeareth that immediatly by this phrase and properly he meant no more, but that *he Dyed and was Buried*: all the rest was consequent as an effect after this, according as he and

Erasm. in
ymb. Ca.
ch. 4.

mod

most others of the Ancients did think. Lastly heer we see that *Rufinus* extendeth this his Descending to the *Divine nature*: but he meaneth it *improperly* and in a certaine sorte, according to that also in the *Philippians*, *He being in the forme of God, humbled himselfe & became obedient vnto death*. So that properly he meaneth it of the very death of his Manhood, and nothing els. Which is our very minde and iudgment, agreeing also generally with the Fathers heerein before rehearsed. But *Ignatius* "you thinke, tis clearly yours: likewise one *Thaddaus*, by *Eusebius* report one of the 70. Disciples which the Evangelist *Luke* speaks of: also *Athanasius* Creed. *Ignatius* saying, *Christ descended to Hades alone, but rose again with many*, meaneth evidently his *Buriall* and going downe into his Grave: as you acknowledge that *Hades* many times may well signifie. Which is the plainer to be his meaning, for as much as he noteth his Buryall heere in no other wordes besides. And sure he alludeth to that in *Mathew*, *The Graves did open, and many bodyes of the Saintes which slept, arose: And came out of the Graves after his Resurrection, and went into the holy City and appeared to many*. This is touching the Resurrection of their bodyes out of their Graves, not of their Soules arising vp from Hell. Neither in *Ignatius* is there any shew of reason that he meant *Hades* for Hell. He may meane, I grant, (that which is in effect all one) the restoring of their whole Persons taken away hence by Death, or their comming from vnder the Dominion and power of Death: which indeed is according to the proper largenes of this word. Also that *Christ* (*karltsbe*) came vnder the same. Nor that he went locally downeward, except in his Buriall; but touching his whole manhood that hee was *humiled and abased even vnder the Dominion and strength of Death*. And thus it is true, that *Christ* by his Death (including also together his Buriall) came downe or Descended. But only this you urge and stand vpon for your claime to *Ignatius*, because it is said, *He brake downe the wall or stop, which was never broken before*. Where you may know that the meaning is this: The power of the Grave, or the strength and force of Death was now by *Christes* Death & Resurrection utterly overcome and dissolved, which remayned in deed from the beginning of the world (till *Christes* death) as a mighty Wall not broken downe. But now the vertue of his death and resurrection brake it cleane downe for ever. So that heereby

a Phil. 2. 6

b Verſe 8.

c Pa. 262.

d Pag. 178.

d Pag. 178.

e Pag. 412.

Ignatius.

f Pag. 14.

g Math. 27.

53.

h As *Rufinus* also vnderſtood it. 300.

Pag. 179.

Iddaus.
anastus.

ascending
plied to
its Soule
(Death)
ever loud
scripture,
in anie
cient
ed.
well ob-
ed: Treat
93.
415.

Dues.

Christ is taught to be (as the Apostle also to like effect speaketh) *the first frutes of the Dead*. But you say, *"Many rose from the dead before Christ, and therefore that partition was often broken by others before him.* I answer, Though some being dead did rise to life againe before Christes Resurrection (as touching the time) yet the vertue and power of Christes resurrection was before them, by which only and meerely they rose againe. Neither yet was Resurrection to all the Dead forthwith performed by the Resurrection of Christ: neuertheles throughly purchased it was ere then, and by the only power and vertue thereof is & shalbe performed to all in due time. So that thus Christ alone brake that wall and stop, and absolutly he hath broken it downe, which no man before him nor besides him ever brake. The like vnto this is your *Thaddaus* sentence: also *Athanasius* in his Creed. Whom the rather thus I vnderstand, (as it seemeth, most reasonably and necessarily) because they expresse neither his *Death*, nor his *Buriall* at all in any other wordes save these, *He descended to Hades*. Therefore surely this is it, which heere they meane by his descending to Hades, and this is all that they meane therein, that he was brought vnder the dominion of death and was Buried. Considering also, that no Ancient Creed in the world hath all these diuers and distinct Clauses, *He Dyed, was Buried, Descended to Hades*: not the very *Apostles Creed* (as we call it) in *Ruffinus* time had them, as we have seene. But this last clause which is in question was put in (since that time (to signify Christs going to Limbo, it seemeth) by whomsoever it was put in, as is before said. Your seeking to prevent this reason, because the Ancient Creeds want sundry other Articles which now are in our vulgar Creed, is to no purpose. For as much as they all do evermore intend to set down perfectly the summe of Christs accomplished Redemption & Mediation at the least. Nor any of those his maine workes are in the omitted. Now alwayes in the Creeds where they expresse his *Dying* and *Burying*, there is omitted his *going to Hades*. Where they expresse his *Going to Hades*, there they omit his *Dying*, or his *Buriall*, or both. Therefore I may well conclude, I thinke, that no Ancient Creed in the world ever meant to teach that Christ went to Hades, except in such a sense only as was (in their iudgement) in effect all one as to Dy, or to go among the Dead, and to be

ried, and no more. Thus farre of *Thaddæus* and *Albanasius* Creeds. Howbeit to speak plainly, your *Thaddæus* whom you so highly esteeme, is a meere counterfeit: You say, This report of him in *Ensebins*, by som men is counted fabulous. Nay, who ever since *Enseb.* (I think) held it for better? Many other like matters are to much allowed by *Enseb.* in other cases also: notwithstanding his story of the church affaires the (I grant) is iustly receaved as the best that we have extant. But it is strange that this fable & fongerie of *Thaddæus* should so please you. It is all forged, or els foully corrupted; for these reasons: 1. This writing touching *Thaddæus* brought by *Ensebins* from *Edessa*, saith, that *Judas* the Apostle (who sent this *Thaddæus* being one of the 70. Disciples) was the same who is called also *Thomas* the Apostle. But the Scripture it selfe sheweth that *Judas* and *Thomas* were 2. divers and severall Apostles. Therefore this writing is false. 2. Heere also we may probably conceive an other errour; that this *Thaddæus* (one of the 70.) seemeth to be mistake in this Syria writing for *Thaddæus* one of the 12. Apostles. 3. Further this counterfeit *Thaddæus* was content to receive (and did receive) even from a King him selfe, and also (as it seemeth) from one of his Nobles, Adoration and worship. Whereas the true servants of Christ *Peter* & the *Angell* refused utterly the same in such very maner offered vnto them by meaner persons in respect of state. Therefore this *Thaddæus*, if he were any, was some false Apostle, and came not by Christes sending, but led by the spirit of errour and seduction: as some were, who went abroad in the name of Disciples and Apostles, in those dayes. 4. Neither doe I see how it can possibly be true which this *Thaddæus* saith, that Christ ascended vp to his Father with a great multitude: seeing the Scripture sheweth how after 40. dayes (the tyme that he conversed with his Apostles) hee ascended in all their sightes, alone vp into Heaven. You get nothing therfore by citing these vngainful witnesses for you. Nor yet by citing the *Apostolike Creed*: seeing you stand only vpon the precise order of the words *He Dyed, was Buried, descended into Hades*. Which how weakely they make for you, before we have shewed. Whervnto this may be added, that verily it seemeth there was no certaine prescript number of Articles in the Creed of olde, much lesse any precise or exact forme of wordes, such as

Thaddæus
corner
a Pag. 17

172
b Pag. 17

None
which
proue
to be
possi-
then:
prove
Manner
c Pag. 1

Wee may
like that
Apostles Creed
is no exact
form of words
by primitive
men.

in the A-
rticles (as be-
fore) there
is received
chief summe
matter, no
certain forme
of words for
common
use.

now we haue, and which is all your hold. This partly by *Rossian* writing vpon it, may be vnderstood: who among the words of the Creed then, rehearseth not diuers materiall wordes, which our v-
suall forme now hath expressely. The Ancients *Ignatius, Irenaeus, Iustin, Tertullian, Origen, &c.* in their Creedes doe differ more both for words, and matter also. Yet they all pretend to rehearse the Apostolike Creed, as by Tradition they receaved it, & as they severally conceaved it: at least so far alwayes as concerned Christs maine & distinct works of Redemption wrought for vs. Neither overthrow you this, in saying, that *some of the want a good many of the Articles which are in the Apostles Creed.* For (as I said) they want none (neither ought they) concerning Christs mediation wrought for vs. His going to Hell was a maine & a distinct part thereof, if he went thither indeed. Wherefore they might not in any wise be defective therein. Against though they want Articles which are now in our forme of the Apostles Creed, yet how prove you that they want any of that, which with them was vulgar and common? Last of all, though some of the Ancients do not perhaps rehearse all the Articles of the Apostolik Creed, (as it was then currant by Tradition in the Churches) yet you have no colour in the world to thinke that none of them all should rehearse it wholly and intirely. But in none of them all is this forme of the Creed found which we now have, and do observe. Yea by the varietie & difference of them all, who still professe that they vnder the Apostolike Creed taught them by Tradition, we may see that the Apostles Creed had not any exact nor precise forme of words at the beginning (as now we have it vsed among vs) but it contained onely (as we may thinke) certaine Heads of Doctrine fundamentall, *That there is one God, 3. Persons, The Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, That the Sonne Iesus Christ is both God and Man, That as man hee was extremely humbled from even unto Death, and after that exalted unto glory in Heaven, whence in due time he shall come to iudgment, &c.* This in effect all Creedes do expresse, but in words they differ greatly, & sometimes some haue mo articles then these: yet such they seeme to be as were on some special occasion more particularly and expressely noted, being otherwise either some part or els some proper effect & consequent from these. And so it might come to passe that some

of the Ancient Creeds differed somewhere in some particular articles from other Creeds, yea all of them in words from each other: and yet in substance, and effect they were all one. Seeing then that the Apostles Creed for the precise forme of words was not the same in the primitive Churches which we now have: yea that, at first it had no exact forme of words at all. For it is sure that no man can prove by good testimony that there was any, or indeed any other then such as these ancient Fathers thus variably and differently rehearsed. Seeing also it is proved, that this set forme which we now have, specially our article in question was not [†] received for many hundred yeares after Christ; some supposing that these words were not put in till neer 1000. yeares after him. I say, All this being considered, it is evident that your Argument only from the precise and exact forme of words in the Creed, & from the order & placing of *He descended to Hades*, namely after *Dead & Buried*, is not worth any thing, to induce thereby an Article of faith, *That Christs Soule went to Hell*.

† As in
the C

After this it shall not be amisse to consider some other reasons of good moment. Our 3^d. Reason is: *If there be no certaine benefit to the godly by Christs going to Hell, then doubtles he went not thither. But there is no certaine benefit to the Godly by Christs going to hell. Therefore doubtles he went not thither.* This Reason you call our strongest fort. It is not our strongest, but yet strong indeed: for you have made no where any good answer to it, neither can you. I know a number of wordes you have throughout your whole treatise denying the Assumption, but they are nothing in the world but meere presumptions. You say, *Is the subduing of hell powers, and the treading on all their forces, and the restraining of all their fury so small a matter with you, that it doth no good to the Godly?* And elsewhere most tediously and vainly you augment & repeat the marvelous thinges that Christe did, by his Humane presence in Hell. I would willingly believe it, but alas who saith so besides your self, or only such as can tell no better then you. Where is that become now, *what I read in the words of God that I believe, what I do not read, that I do not believe, &c.* It is easy to say, that you will onely hold what the Scripture assurith: but in practice you will slip from this precise order, when you list. I know well that you boldly say that the *Parable of Christs des-*

REAS

a Page

b Page

c Page

d Page

cent is plainly professed in Scriptures, to be the spoyling of Sathan, and delivering of men from the power of Hell. Is it plainly professed? I beseech you, where? I wott well what you will faine & devise of the Fathers, when you impute so palpable vntuths to the word of God it self. Shew vs one title, one iot of any benefit which (by the Scriptures) Christ wrought for vs by his locall presence in Hell, and then I will cease to gainsay it forever. Otherwise tell vs never so much of the wonderfull and singular fruite of Christs being there, the more you amplify, the more you hazard your credit, & the more we shall wonder at your bold avouching matters which are not in the word of God. The benefits all and every one (which you every where rehearse) I most vnfaignedly and religiously beleve: namely that he deserved all good things for vs, and obtayned the for vs in his Resurrectio, &c. Ascension: and that finally and fully he shall in his last iudgment tread downe Satan vnder our feet. But what is this to his locall being in Hell? Shew therefore I say by the expresse word that Christ *in Hel* did these, or any parte of these good things for vs. If you do not (for as yet I see no title to prove that) surely all your talke is but blasts of vancie. The which I rather beleve that you never can nor wil do, because you confesse as much somewhere as overturneth all your shew of Christes doing good to vs in Hell. For, *This conquest (you say) Christ purchased by his passion, but he did not execute it till his resurrection.* If he executed nothing till his Resurrection, and purchased all in his Passion, then he did nothing in Hell. For his Resurrection was distinctly after his supposed being in Hell, whither he never afterwards returned to execute there any thing at all. Nay, Austin your only stay thinketh *he descended in vaine, vnles he did good to som who were even there in Hell in torments.* But this you utterly renounce. So that every way stil it remaineth good, that seeing there is no certaine benefit that Christ did in Hell, neither to vs, nor to any, therefore we are not to beleue that he was in Hell.

Our 4. Reason: *There is altogether as great reason and as urgent cause that Christ whole man (both Soule, and Body) should be present in Hell to free vs thence wholly, (that is our Soules, & Bodies) as there is that his Soule must be there present to free thence our Soules. But simply it is confessed that his Body was never there,*

neither had any cause to be, for the freeing of our Bodies. Therefore it followeth, that neither his Soule was ever there, nor had any cause so to be, for the freeing of our Soules. Heere I wish, you would answer my proposition without Skoffes & taunts and haughty disdain, as your manner is. But bring some evident and cleere difference that his Soule must go more necessarily thither alone then that his Body also should; and let it be truly grounded on the proportion of faith and Christian Religion, if not on expresse Scripture. I wot well what you bring from some Fathers, ^a *Fulgentius*, ^b *Ashanasius*, & others, That his Soule by being present in Limbo, (that they meane by *Hades* and *Infernum*) saved vs from Hell, & by his flesh temporally dying he gave vs life eternall, and by lying in the grave vncorrupted he gave vs incorruptio. Heere we allow them so far as they meane, that what one parte of him did, that our whole man and every parte received good by. But if they think, his Soule by Divine ordinance had need to be actually present elswhete, then only with the godly deceased, to execute his victorie gotten before on the Crosse against Satan, to thend that we might be free fro Hell, the let the shew vs the Scripture for this Divine ordinance: & so (by Gods grace) we shal forthwith embrace it. Otherwise at least let them shew vs a reason (or do you so much for them) why both parts ioyntly should not rather have gon thither by like necessity to execute that together, which both ioyntly had got and deserved for together: the benefit also whereof is to come (not to one parte alone, but) ioyntly to both in vs. Again, why this going to Hell by our Saviour Christ was not rather after his Resurrection, when he had begun his actual Triumph indeed by ioyning together againe both partes of his manhood, in both which together before he had bene humbled. Neither is it likely that he began it before his Resurrection, seeing the Scripture ^b every where noteth this as the first part of his exaltation after death, and it being strange in Christian reason & against proportion of faith to think, that one parte of Christ (his Soule) should gloriously triumph, the other (his Body) all this while lying in Humiliation, possessed with death in the Grave, which you say is the Devils range. A part of his power, and of the Kingdom of darkness. Ye also seeing it is most likely that he would cleare himselfe wholly and intirely in both partes, before he would begin to strip

a Pag. 176

b Pag. 177
111.

b Math.
Luke 2.
Act. 2. 2
& 3. 15
40. & 1
17. 3. &
Rom. 4.
6. 4. & 1
Cor. 15.
1. 20. 1
24. 2 T
21.

strip and spoyle Satan for vs. Lastly seeing it is a greater degree of triumph & victory to spoyle the enemy, to tread him vnder foote, to breake his houses and strong holds, to set free the captiues, to make him and his to bow the knee to the conquerour, then to get perfit life & freedom to himselfe. So that alwayes that, is after this. Wherefore it seemeth that Christe did thus also. If he did actually such thinges in Hell, it was not till after his Resurrection, before which time he had not perfit life and deliverance himselfe. Let vs I pray have some cleere and Christian reason against these strong likelyhoods: and then let vs aske a point or two more, which we think will follow likewise, if your assertion be true. First, if one part of Christ, viz: his Soule only were in Hel to execute his victory which before hee had merited on the Crosse, then why in his sufferinges, righteousnes, and obedience might not one parte of Christs manhood have aswell suffiered. I say why might not one parte alone have in this world merited enough (which Appollinaris an Heretick affirmed) aswell as that one parte might serve to triumph for vs in Hell. Againe seeing his Body in the Grave by overcoming corruption which is *a part of the Kingdom of Satan* as you say, did thereby save our bodies fro that part of Satans walke, as you call it, by what reason is it that thereby he destroyed not consequentlie the whole kingdom of Satan, saving thereby our Soules also, in so much that Christs Soule might not have needed to have come into Hell for that purpose. Or if they meane that his flesh being in the Grave, and his Soule being in Hell did severally and distinctly save our flesh and our soules, then how will you be reconciled with them, who do deny that point. Further for the actual stripping of Satan of his spoiles, why was it needfull that an actual presence of any parte of his manhood should be in Hell, seeing indeed it is certaine that the whole actual triumph of Christ over Satan proceedeth not of the proper vertue of the manhood, but onely from the vertue and power of the Godhead of Christ. Therefore that might possibly be as effectually and as fully accomplished in the absence of the manhood as in the presence: all the while that the Godhead and manhood were still vnited and continually together in one Person. Last of all, if it were the very humane presence of his soule that delivered our soules from thence, that they shall never come thence

216.

for selfe
reth it,
all men

that, why did not the presence of his flesh in the Grave keepe ours
that it should never come there, or at least that it should never
putrifie nor rot, as his flesh did not. All these sequels and conse-
quences are as good and as likely as your assertion, that Christes
Soule (and not his flesh) ought to be locally in Hell for this end,
that ours might never come there.

Further, I made this Argument in my "former Treatise, ^{a Pa. 166.}
that Christes Descending into Hell (if ever hee did so) could not
be iudged any part of his *Exaltation* or *Glorification*. To which
your reply is, I know not whether more strange, or skornful. But
you ^{† Pa. 146.} resolve that these words *He descended to Hell*, importeth
his *Exaltation* and *Triumph*. Yet you skoffe at me for the like:
as if I had said, "*His Descending was Ascending: & Hell was Hea-* ^{a Pa.}
ven. But heerin you affirme vntuly. 1. I say, Though his Soule
leaving his body Ascended: yet this is not meant by that phrase,
He descended to Hades. 2. I never said that Hades signified Hea-
ven, although some in * Hades are in Heaven. 3. Much lesse did I ^{a In a ble}
ever say, that *Hell* is *Heaven*. Why the cry you out of * ^{* Pa.} *impuden-*
sie, facing, ridiculous, and audacious, presumption. &c. Who *pre-*
sumeth let the advised reader iudge, when you thus confidently
avouch as an article of faith that *Christes Soule locally descended;*
and yet bring not one prooffe of it from Gods word, nor from any
mans opinion, whom you will cleave vnto fully. That ^{b Pa.} you a-
vouch " *Phil. 2.* for it, is more straunge: where we have not one
word of his local being in Hel. And that the * *Colossians 2.* should
proove it, passeth all the rest. Where (though we graunt you your
reading) yet the expresse text referreth that triumph to Christes
Crosse: which you openly deny. That of the *Councells*, howe
Christ rose againe, *having spoyled Hell*, I easily yeeld; seeing that
proveth not his locall being there. The same I affirme of that Al-
legoric in *Luke*; which sheweth Christes * *Overcoming, Binding,*
and Spoyling of Satan in deed: but not by his locall being in Hel.
What if Christ doe set out many pointes of doctrine by Parables?
Yet such are those pointes, as are proved otherwise and elsewhere.
The Parables doe but illustrate them. Howbeit this Parable in
question, Christ expressly applyeth to his *Dispossessing* of Divells
out of mens bodyes. Wherefore you ought not to wrest it to ano-
ther thing, whereof there he hath not a word, nor any where els:

that is, to shew how Christ bound the Divell in Hell locally. Rather remember, I pray, howe God shewed his displeasure against your wresting of his word, by that strange terrour that happened even then, when you were descended into the depth of this vn-couth doctrine at Paules Crosse. Which for the time so affrighted many 1000. of people, that it will never be forgotten in England while your opinions be remembred: albeit this grew but of a small occasion, as after it seemed.

Where you charge me in the end, *arrogantly and absurdly to falsifie the Synod of our Realme*, it is but what your selfe doth in effect. I said, *Our Synod corrected K. Edwardes Synod*. You acknowledge and professe that "*in the later words of that former Synod now left out, are 3. things that cannot be iustified by the Scriptures. 1. That the Spirites of the iust were in Hell. 2. That Christ there preached vnto them. 3. That he stayed there till his Resurrection.* Which our Synod since *very profitably hath overskipped and suppressed*. First then your selfe granteth, that our later Synod corrected the former about this matter: which in my wordes you cannot indure to heare. 2. You charge these wordes of K. Edw. Synod. with 2. pointes, which are not in them. 1. That it saith, how *the Spirits of the iust were in Hell*: and that Christ descending thither, *stayed there till his resurrection*. In me you would make this a great matter, so to misreport the wordes of a Synod, which in deed saith nothing heereof. 3. It is well that you renounce that of "*Peter, (by Austins direction) as making not at all for any locall being of Christ in Hell.* But yet heerein your selfe openly refuseth the minde of all your predecessors, yea of our later Synod, if they believed as you vrge that they did. For if they liked Christs locall being in Hel, they misliked not the applying of that in *Peter* therevnto: as by Mai. Nowells *Catechisme* may appear. Neither misliked they his tarying there *till his resurrection*: which *Austin* also holdeth as firmly, as that he was there. All which you vtterly disclaime, as wel as I. Why then do you aggravat my differing from them, and see not your owne. 4. That our English Cleargie generally did or doe beleewe Christes locall descent into Hell (although they reade and rehearse those words so translated) certainly no man will, nor ought to acknowledge. Every man is assured of the cōtrarie. You can argue nothing then heere-

heerein by our vsuall naming of this word *Hell*, in this place of the Creed. Which yet is al that you ^{*} have heere. So that your conclusion is vaine. *If Hell in English bee Hell, and going downe bee descending, &c.* Likewise is that, You are content to be tryed by all the Fathers both Greeke and Latin. Who all (as hath ben shewed) doe make against your opinion. Also as touching the Scripture you are vtterly destitute thereof: which yet alone must take place with vs in this matter. All that you bring for your purpose, are meerely mistaken & mistranslated wordes of Scriptures, Creedes, and Fathers: as (I hope) hath plainly bene proved. This therfore may suffice for vs to refuse your doctrine in these points. Wisdome shalbe iustified of all her children. To God only wise be praise through IESVS CHRIST for ever. *Rom. 16. 17.*

FINIS.

Pagina	Lin.	Faultes.	Correction
13.	in marg.	pag. 8.	pag. 7.
23.	37.	he	they
24.	2.	their	the
37.	29.	will	well
36.	22. in marg.	your	you
49.	24.	ne	
57.	7.	herefore	heeretofore
65.	28.	externally	eternally.
65.	8.	better	bitter
77.	in marg:	b pag. 51. 55.	b pag. 71. 73.
103.	33.	torments.	torments: yet not only to it.

**The diverse Significations of the Greeke Word Hades; Which is here
according to the Circumstances of the places where it is used. See pag. 177.
Wherunto also the Hebrew Sheol may be rightly compared.**



